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Abstract

Throughout history the agency of social citizenship has resulted in actions that both include and exclude certain individuals and groups through political, economic, and civic interaction. This creates abject spaces of limited rights, inclusion and belonging. Divergent and nested lived experiences of how processes and practices of social citizenship are enacted, embodied, and emplaced necessitate a re-problematizing of the context from the hegemonic view of Canada as a pluralistic liberal multicultural state to one where multiple divergent epistemologies collide in a state of continued settler colonialism. This comparative case study in the Pacific Northwest of what is now called Canada explores how two civil society organizations (CSOs) facilitate or hinder Settler and Indigenous individuals’, groups’, and communities’ agency through social action. CSOs are sites of social action that have the power to create spaces where all citizens have a voice in their own social well-being through participation, partnership, and power sharing. The re-problematizing allows for the exploration of how the reframing of political and civil space impacts interactions and relationships to investigate what these sites tell us about participants’ perceptions and lived experiences of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in the lived experience of processes and practices of social citizenship.

Lay Summary

This comparative case study in the Pacific Northwest of what is now called Canada explores how two civil society organizations (CSOs) facilitate or hinder Settler and Indigenous individuals’, groups’, and communities’ lived experience of the processes and practices of social citizenship. Social action of these two CSOs are explored: Rotary International’s Write to Read BC project with the Tšilhqot’in Nation via the communities of Tl’ésqóx and Tl’éťinqóx in the Province of British Columbia and in the Territory of the Yukon with Kwanlin Dün First Nations via the Yukon Child Development Centre and the Dusk’a Headstart Centre. This case study is bound within 10 years (2009-2019) and includes multiple sharing circles, organization or community observations, and 40 participant interviews. The aim is to centre often abject or marginalized voices to explore whose knowledge counts in how social citizenship is enacted, embodied, and emplaced. Participants' lived experiences highlight how there is nothing ‘post’ about colonialism in their social realities and this context of continued settler colonialism shapes their nested lived experience of social citizenship. Values in action need to be linked to place-based best practices and require continual decolonization and uncolonization efforts as they are politics in relation.
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Figure 1. First Peoples Cultural Council: First Nations Languages in British Columbia (2022)
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Chapter One: Introduction

As a comparative case study of the Pacific Northwest region of Canada – inclusive of British Columbia and the Yukon – the underlying purpose of this research is to explore what two potential sites tell us about the perception and reality of the roles of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in the lived experiences of processes and practices of social citizenship. To do so this dissertation applies the analytical frameworks of citizenship, indigeneity, abjection or marginalization, and civil society to explore the role of civil society organizations in Indigenous and Settler social citizenship processes and practices within the Pacific Northwest of what is now called Canada. The exploration utilizes a mixed qualitative methodology and an intersectional indigeneity approach to process trace and thematically analyze 40 participants’ interviews, sharing circles, observations, and organizational and community-based documents from two cases. This comparative case study is also an example of taking on a Settler research process that incorporates Indigenous ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing to guide the research. It demonstrates how this mixed-qualitative methodology and intersectional indigeneity approach can be utilized to do an interdisciplinary focused exploration by a Settler scholar of mixed-heritage.

The first case is in British Columbia with T̓s'ilhqot'in and Settler participants who interacted via Rotary International and the Write to Read BC project. The second case is in the Yukon with Kwanlin Dün, other Indigenous women now living in Whitehorse, and Settlers who interacted via Child Development Centre and Dusk’a Headstart Family Learning Centre. The mixed qualitative method and intersectional indigeneity approach enables the exploration of these two cases to focus on whose knowledge counts in how social citizenship is enacted, embodied, and emplaced in Pacific Northwest. By focusing on social citizenship, non-political action is explored that challenges hegemonic narratives of citizenship in what is now Canada and creates space for counter narratives that problematizes social citizenship within the context of continued settler colonialism and its place-based impacts. This comparative case study provides insights into the lived experience of social citizenship as rights and as reciprocity, and as belonging, as relational and as spiritual.

The first chapter of the dissertation starts with the background of the comparative case study, lays out the problem of the study, describes the significance, and offers a snapshot of the mixed qualitative methodology used. The final section of the chapter notes the limitations of the study and defines some special terms used throughout.
1.1 Background

The initial premise is that Canada portrayed as a uniformly inclusive, liberal, multicultural, open, welfare state is incorrect and misleading. As Coulthard (2014) argues, this hegemonic view leads to the state framing colonialism as part of the past not the present, which in turn negates a colonial present and the systems of acculturative violence. Thus, the state tends to focus on reconciliation that does not transform the current institutional and social relationships that result in the systematic and systemic levels of suffering, i.e., reconciliation without restitution. Other scholars also challenge the rhetoric of Canada’s nation-building mythology. They call into question the colonial narratives and discontinuity of political, economic, and social disparities between Settler \(^1\) and Indigenous \(^2\) populations, (i.e., Wiebe, 2014; Ward, 2014; Lee, 2014). The stark reality of Indigenous peoples, the lived experience in Canada of hundreds of years of abjection politically, legally, and socially, necessitates a view of the country from the perspective of both the colonizer and colonized. Therefore, I propose a re-problematizing of the research context from the hegemonic view of Canada as a pluralistic liberal multicultural state to one of continued settler colonialism. Two pieces of governing legislation, the Indian Act 1876 and the Constitution Act 1982, continue to divide citizens within Canada based solely on a question of ‘status’ or race. Utilizing indigeneity principles in an intersectional based approach through the lens of social constructionism and institutionalism, I set my research of Indigenous and Settler social citizenship processes and practices in civil society within this re-problematized context. For it is within this dualism that spaces and places of abjection or limited inclusion are created and sustained; where citizenship is often a political, legal, and social reality based solely on race or status.

Continued settler colonialism, otherwise referred to as colonialism in the present, creates false barriers between Indigenous and Settler citizens, and creates an overreaching negative synergy of misrecognition. Canada’s continued settler colonial legacy includes Residential Schools which interrupted the passing on of parenting skills and traditions, facilitated the loss of language, low literacy and economic attainment all combined with a system of governance without any inherent accountability to Indigenous populations. It is argued to have a severe, lasting, and ongoing negative social impact (i.e., Cannon & Sunseri, \(^1\) ‘Settler’ refers to Canadian citizens descended from the colonial population, together with contemporary immigrants to Canada. 
\(^2\) ‘Indigenous’ here refers and is “inclusive of all first peoples – unique in our own cultures – but common in our experience of colonialism and our understanding of the world” (Wilson, S., 2008: 16).
That impact often silences the contestation and action or agency of Indigenous people that leads to the everyday experience of non-recognition of their rights to self-determination. For example, this can be seen in the 2016 Canadian Human Rights Tribunal’s decision that substantiated all aspects of the First Nations Caring Society and the Assembly of First Nations (2016 CHRT 2) claim of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada’s (INAC) discriminatory conduct regarding First Nations family and child welfare on the grounds of race and national ethnic origins. Research by the First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada et al. (2016) clearly demonstrates that for every dollar spent on non-Indigenous family and child welfare only 78¢ is spent on Indigenous family and child welfare and that there are now three times as many Indigenous children in care than during the height of the Indian Residential School era. According to the 2016 Census data, there are twelve times as many Indigenous children in the foster care system meaning almost 52.2 percent of children are now removed from their families (Government of Canada, 2021). The 2011 National Household Survey shows 38 percent of Indigenous children are living below the poverty line, more than four times the national average. These statistics portray the abject realities of the quality of life for many Indigenous children and youth: suicide rates of Indigenous youth are five to seven times higher than settler youth; life expectancy is five to seven years less than settlers; infant mortality rates are one and a half times higher; young people are more likely to end up in jail than graduate high school; and, children receive 22 percent less funding for child welfare services (AFN 2012, 2011; MacDonald & Wilson, 2016; Government of Canada 2021). The situation in many Indigenous communities, including those explored through this research, is further exacerbated by infrastructure and capital needs where approximately 47 percent of all Indigenous communities need a new school and 72 percent of all schools in Indigenous communities have health and safety concerns (32 percent have issues with access to clean water). Social suffering, as Adelson (2005; 2000) points out, and our collective responses to it, are both social and political phenomenon. Real change, some scholars and advocates argue, will only come through reconciliation with restitution when the ‘yoke of colonialism’ is replaced with economic and political autonomy imbued with the principles of indigeneity on Indigenous controlled land bases (i.e., Alfred, 2009; Cannon & Sunseri, 2018; Coulthard, 2014; Green, 2014; Fleras &

---

3 Ministry was split into two in 2017 and became the Ministry of Crown Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs and Ministry of Indigenous Services.
Therefore, in this context of continued colonialism the comparative case study in the Pacific Northwest of Canada explores how civil society organizations (CSOs) facilitate or hinder marginalized individuals, groups or communities’ social citizenship processes and practices through the social action of service delivery and advocacy.

Social power relationships are often built upon these colonial-settler foundations that perpetuate the phenomenon of continued settler colonialism in Canada (Helin, 2011, 2008; Saul, 2008; Hansen, 2009; Stasiulis & Jhappen 1995). Barriers “that should have never been there” (McCue, 2014) are constructed between people based on a foreign philosophy of “otherness” instead of the North American Indigenous philosophy or approach of inclusion or “sameness” (Helin, 2011, 2008; Ladner, 2008; Saul, 2008). Continued colonial value paradigms create and sustain existing structural and systematic racism that necessitate an exploration to determine how the current state of continued settler colonialism in Canada persists and sustains these practices or acts (Helin, 2008; Ladner 2008; Murphy, 2005; Saul, 2008). This type of misrecognition leads to what Fraser (2008) calls ‘misframing’, “a meta-political type of misrepresentation” (p.6) that requires critical interrogation when mapping social injustices in political or civil spaces. In reaction to this I have re-framed civil society as a space between the state, the market and family life, a sphere of service delivery and social activism (Emejulu & Bassel, 2013), where the contestation and reconstruction of citizenship can occur through alternative discourses and actions. More specifically this “space between” or sphere and spectrum of social action, is where citizens or groups of people can negotiate, deliberate, or debate what constitutes a ‘common good’ (Fioramonti & Konoykhina, 2015; Fioramonti & Firoiri, 2010; Henrich & Firoamonti, 2007; Kamat, 2004; Keane, 2003; Skocpol, 2003; Lewis, 2001). It is within this ‘space between’ of civil society that civil society organizations (CSOs) in the context of continued settler colonialism in Canada could provide a historical and contemporary sense making of vertical and horizontal shifts in the lived experience of social citizenship practices and processes through the exploration of social actions. Explored in further detail in chapter three, CSOs I argue are non-governmental spatial social phenomena. CSOs require skills, means, and power to promote shared ideas through a spectrum of social discourse and action, i.e., advocacy and service or resource distribution. This type of exploration that frames CSOs as both sites of social citizenship and sites of research on social citizenship could potentially explain shifts in interactions within civil society.
Critical theories of democracy give the world a normative description of what citizenship ought to be. However, throughout history the agency of citizenship has resulted in actions that both include and exclude certain individuals and groups through political, economic, and civic interactions that in turn create abject spaces (limited space of rights, inclusion, and belonging). The re-problematizing of the Canadian context as continued settler colonialism allows a re-exploration of how this re-framing of political or civil space as abject, as exclusionary, and as marginalizing impacts interactions and relationships. Interactions based on power, race, ethnicity, class, and gender between citizen groups and individuals are negotiated through social citizenship processes and practices in the pursuit of re-framing social justice. Canada’s continued failure to address the gaps in social justice, equality, and rights that continued settler colonialism creates between Indigenous and Settler citizens perpetuates, according to Macdonald and Wilson (2013,) a continued denial of basic human rights. A denial that is linked to the disproportionately higher rate of Indigenous children living below the poverty line; 12% for all Canadian children versus 40% for all Indigenous children (ibid).

Seeking pluralism in politics is, as Blair (1997) argues, one of the avenues that enables the inclusion of marginalized (non)citizens. The examination of the political and going beyond the notion of the sovereign citizen to a consideration that an individual may act across and reproduce a multiplicity of citizenships regimes that are inclusive of both the spatial and the temporal acknowledges the multiplicity of ways of knowing and doing citizenship from the actor’s perspective (Hepworth, 2014; Isin, 2013). It allows for the incorporation of theories of social abjection and ‘abject spaces’ – the limited spaces of rights inclusion and belonging where abject citizens are rendered invisible and/or inaudible (Isin & Rygrel, 2007). I contend that civil society organizations have the potential to be this bridge to inclusion and thus explore how CSOs facilitate or hinder social citizenship processes and practices.

As Smith articulates “the past, our stories local and global, the present, our communities, cultures, languages and social practices – all may be spaces of marginalization [however]…they are also spaces of resistance and hope” (2012:4). Civil society as the space between has the potential through individual and organizational agency to be a site of social action towards re-imagining, re-capturing, and re-constructing citizenship through alternative discourses and acts of social citizens – Settler and Indigenous alike. As Choudry and Kapoor (2010) argue, civil society is a place and a space for activism for social action and informal learning and knowledge production. They articulate a need for an “anti-colonial framework”
to challenge the “hegemonic NGOs and civil society positions” (p.6) in order to ensure the agency, voice and knowledge of ‘other’ or ‘marginalized citizens’ are counted through critical scrutiny. This follows from arguments on the processes of de-colonizing or un-colonizing methodologies and the ideological approaches of both intersectionality and indigeneity. These approaches are critical and will allow the highlighting of how, within the context of continued settler colonialism the persistent impositions of colonial and imperial logics, of racism and sexism, leads to power abuses both vertically and horizontally (Smith, 2012; Green, 2007, Rodriguez, 2020). An example of vertical power abuse is the Indian Act 1876, a macro level legislation that impacts both meso and micro level social processes and practices with the dual discrimination of race and gender experienced by Indigenous women. Horizontally the Indian Act 1876 is also experienced as lateral violence. It creates what Fanon (1993) argues is a discourse of colonial subjugation and therefore the reframing or renaming of Canada as a continued settler colonial state is in alignment with his notion that a “mastery of language affords a remarkable power” (p.19).

As a researcher of mixed heritage raised in the Settler ontologies and epistemologies of Canadian settler culture, I argue that both intersectionality and indigeneity, or an intersectional indigeneity approach, allow me to consider political and social conditions within this re-problematised context. It also allows for critical reflexivity, to continually strive to un/decolonize my ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing to articulate and construct different types of solutions that do not further impede, subjugate, or re-colonize (see Rodriguez (2020) and discussion in chapter three). By situating the lived experiences of the processes and practices of social citizenship within this anti-colonial, or continued settler colonialism context, I attempt to give voice to the ‘other’ and construct another narrative that needs to be told. As a result, my doctoral research explores the relationships, interactions, and intersections of citizens across the political and legal categories in Canada. I use this lens of continual settler colonialism to guide my exploration of the relationships, interactions, and intersections of citizens in CSOs as they are places of social action and can create spaces where all citizens have a voice in their own social well-being.

1.2 The Problem to Explore: Questions of Whose Knowledge Counts

This research focuses on how social citizenship theory can be used to explore the agency of the ‘outsider’ in civil society whether it be individuals, groups, communities, or organizations through citizen acts in abject spaces. My skills, knowledge, and experiences combined within the limited scope of a PhD thesis necessitates an approach that focuses on one of these avenues. Accordingly, I determine the most fitting approach is an investigation
within civil society on one dimension of citizenship, the social. Privilege – the capacity of choice – and abjection – the limited or lack of equity of choice – are linked to individuals’, groups’, communities’, or organizations’ social and cultural capital. The social aspect of citizenship is described by T.H. Marshall (1965; 1950) as the balance between the civil and political. Like social citizenship, CSOs are also arguably a “space between”, a social space that interweaves the civil and political nested in the sociohistorical context and the lived experience of citizens. By focusing on a single dimension of citizenship both similarities and dissimilarities in the lived experiences of social citizenship processes and practices can be explored potentially highlighting methods for overcoming social inequalities that make attaining civic and political agency more difficult for some. This process allows construction of arguments around my main research question: how do CSOs facilitate/hinder Indigenous individuals, groups, and communities lived experience of the processes and practices of social citizenship? Knowledge is also constructed around four sub questions:

- how does the history of the continued context of settler colonialism shape contemporary Indigenous and Settler social citizenship processes and practices;
- how does this context shape the places and spaces where interactions and relationships occur between CSOs and Indigenous and Settler individuals, groups, and communities;
- what are the differences in the CSOs rhetoric and action and how are these differences perceived; and,
- how does indigeneity and notions of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency via gender, race or ethnicity, and colonization intersect in these lived experiences of the processes and practices of social citizenship?

These sub-questions allow me to explore what is working or what is not and if social citizenship processes and practices are static, a part of the historical context, or dynamic, evolving and changing over time. The comparative case study design allows me to explore the different elements of social citizenship found within civil society. Using these research questions, I qualitatively assess the impacts, both positive and negative, of the relationships and interactions between CSOs and participants in the lived experience of social citizenship. In doing so I am able to push forward the literature on civil society demonstrating how it is a space where social action and movements occur as Choudry and Kapoor (2010) argue. These authors argue that these sites of political processes and knowledge construction are often
ignored by academia. As such, my research explores what these potential sites of interaction tell us about the perception and reality of the roles and agency in the lived experience of social citizenship. Exploring the lived experiences of social citizenship processes and practices through an intersectional indigeneity-based approach to analysis allows for an examination and conceptualization of the social realities of Canadian multiculturalism in a continued settler context, as well as the relationships and interaction of CSOs with both Settler and Indigenous peoples in Canada. It raises the question of whose knowledge counts. Law (2004) argues the ‘methodological mess’ of social science research must look at how knowledge is constructed in specific historical contexts that leads to how knowledge produces methods and thus reality (p.5). Knowledge production is argued to be an interlocking of epistemology and ontology that is neither acultural or apolitical and intersects with the perception and reality of a citizen’s agency. Whose knowledge counts, when and how, helps define citizenship and social action and thus social citizenship processes and practices. I therefore explore citizenship theory through the lens of the settler colonialism as the “space” within which the acts of civil society organization happen and what role they play in research participants’ lived experience of the processes and practices of social citizenship.

1.3 Significance of the study

Statistics Canada’s (2011) National Household Survey data shows 1,400,685 people indicated they “identified as Aboriginal (status Indian, First Nation, Inuit or Metis)” and this comprises approximately 4.3 percent of the national population of Canada. Therefore, the context of Canada and the focus on Indigenous lived experience of social citizenship affects almost 1.5 million individuals and thus argues to the size and scope of this challenge. Thus, fulfilling my research purpose and aim to contribute to the literature on Indigenous and Settler social citizenship construction in civil society in the Pacific Northwest of Canada requires awareness and reflexivity. Both are key to contestation and the re-problematization of Canada as a continued settler colonial state. Pillow (2003) argues that this type of ‘uncomfortable reflexivity’ allows a researcher to both challenge the construction of data while “acknowledging the political need to represent and find [alternative] meaning” (p.192). Embedding uncomfortable reflexivity into the research design will ensure accountability to Indigenous struggles in the pursuit of self-representation and self-determination (Viswewaran, 1994) while actively pursuing the research aims and objectives. Social constructionism, institutionalism, and principles of indigeneity and intersectionality allow me to be critical in theorizing and acknowledging that the knowledge or data findings will be constructed. The fact that I am a privileged Canadian Settler of mixed heritage highlights the
biases of my scholarly discourse which are most influenced by the colonial legacy of France and Great Britain, the settlers that contribute to the democratic processes and practices of Canada, and the social conditions and political debates from the Indigenous perspectives. As similar historical and social conditions can be found in other places, it is my hope that the research may provide another narrative of the role of civil society organizations within other contexts. It is primarily for this reason, after exploring an array of methodological literature, in particular Smith’s (2012) theory of decolonizing methodology and Kovach’s (2009) mixed qualitative methods approach, that I propose a comparative case study design to explore the research question in Canada at two sites in the Pacific Northwest. This methodological approach and case study design permits an exploration of the similarities and differences at the macro level of the influences of the Canadian context in practice, the action or agency at each site’s micro level, and in the intersections at the meso level. The research findings fill a gap in the literature with regard to research on or with CSOs in general and two CSOs in particular and First Nations in the Pacific Northwest and two First Nations in particular. Also, this dissertation does not focus on the global south but within my own backyard of the Pacific Northwest of Canada thus addressing another gap in the literature. Lastly, these findings could also be compared or contrasted in other contexts and countries with similar colonial or imperial histories, in particular countries with Indigenous populations that are also members of the British Commonwealth. The research has the potential to be an example of how CSOs who work with marginalized populations can be culturally diverse and culturally safe spaces of inclusion. It allows, as Wiebe (2014) argues, to draw “attention to the rich texture and particularities of citizen action rooted in place” (p.539) in the spaces between.

1.4 Overview of the methodology

This comparative case study applies an intersectional indigeneity based thematic analysis to look at how CSOs’ values are translated into the relationships and intersects of social citizenship processes and practices within these specific spaces/places. This allows for an understanding of the apparent ‘caution’ in relationships between Indigenous and Settler populations from multi-cultural and historical perspectives. Intersectionality origins within Black Feminism make it a specific strand of critical theory that shifts focus from the dominate heteronormative male perspective and their lived experiences to the experiences of women of colour and other multiple oppressed people (Hill-Collins, 2015; 1993; Crenshaw, 1993; 1991; Yuval -Davis, 2006). Hill-Collins argues the generally intersectionality refers to “the critical insights that race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nation, ability, and age operate not as unitary, mutually exclusive entities, but as reciprocally constructing
phenomena that in turn shape complex social inequalities” (2015: 2). Inclusion is the primary pursuit of intersectionality Hancock asserts accomplished by “incorporating previously ignored and excluded populations into pre-existing frameworks to broaden our knowledge base regarding traditional questions of political science” (2007: 248). Indigeneity principles further highlight these intersects of race, class, gender, sexuality, ethnicity, nation, ability, and age with another interlocking oppression: colonization and continued settler colonization (Clark, 2012; Fleras & Maaka, 2010; Hunt, 2013). Combined with the socio-historic context, continued settler colonialism embodied through Indian Act thus creates multiple interlocking oppressions for Indigenous women that adversely impacts Indigenous ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. Therefore, an intersectional indigeneity approach enables what is considered normative to therefore be challenged by centring key female voices both Indigenous and Settler in both cases to explore the lived experiences of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency by going beyond the predominate Settler male centric colonial record. Putting these voices at the centre of this knowledge production has the potential to expand the understanding of the lived, practiced, and relational ways for all of how CSOs facilitate or hinder social citizenship processes and practices.

Applying mixed qualitative methods that make use of a comparative case study design allows for the use of a wide range of evidence, semi-structured interviews, sharing circles, direct participant or organizational observation, and secondary data. The design is multi-level and uses mixed qualitative methods to describe the macro level context of Canada as a continued settler colonial state and to explore the meso and micro levels of the agency of and the interactions between both CSOs and Settler or Indigenous individuals, groups, and communities in social citizenship processes and practices. These methodological choices are aligned with the research aim of centring the often abject or marginalized voices to explore whose knowledge counts in how social citizenship is enacted, embodied, and emplaced in Pacific Northwest.

Case selection is therefore both purposive and relational. It employs a ‘criterion’ sampling, as it involved choosing sites that meet a predetermined criterion of importance (Patton, 2015). I chose to focus on CSOs that work with Indigenous individuals, groups or work in communities providing service or advocacy. As stated in the introduction, and in alignment with indigeneity and intersectionality approaches, awareness of my privileged position within Canadian society as both an academic and privileged Settler citizen of mixed heritage is key. It is also key to my ability to be reflexive in my challenges and contestations in re-problematizing Canada as a continued settler colonial state. This approach as Kovach
(2010) argues allows for methods based on a combination of Indigenous epistemologies and protocols and academic thematic analysis via inclusion of the subjective through the relational interconnectedness and interrelatedness of all things, including the land. An approach that requires as Wilson (2008) argues respect, relational responsibility, and relational accountability. As a privileged Canadian Settler of mixed heritage adopting this mixed qualitative methodology and intersectional indigeneity approach facilitates my ability explore how of CSOs facilitate or hinder Indigenous and Settler social citizenship processes and practices within the context of continued settler colonialism. It also enables me to contribute to our understanding of Indigenous Settler relations in the Pacific Northwest in a way that is respectful, honours relational responsibility and accountability, and highlights the profound complexities of un/decolonizing social processes and practices of individuals, groups, and communities.

Both cases in the study therefore varied on the dependent variable, the lived experience of social citizenship. King, Keohane and Verba (1994) argue when making case selection based on the dependent variable a researcher must ensure the dependent variable has other values and this is why a dissimilar design was chosen. A critical sampling strategy that uses the definitions theorized previously is used in conjunction to ensure representation of the central phenomenon (Patton, 1990). Therefore, I utilize a dissimilar design to explore two purposively and relationally selected case studies in the Pacific Northwest of Canada and capture the diverse expertise of two CSOs and lived experience of social citizenship of 40 participants, both Settler and Indigenous, through mixed-qualitative methods.

Beyond these epistemological approaches of case selection are the logistics and the mechanics of selecting these two cases with these CSOs within the Pacific Northwest of what is now called Canada. Logistically the two cases fulfill the requirements of a PhD in Canadians Studies and requirements for funding secured. Case selection is also based the research purpose and research question and driven by both theoretical and empirical considerations. Scholars also recommend exploratory studies focused on ‘how’ research questions be comprised of multiple cases (Yin, 2014; George & Bennett, 2004; Kaarbo & Beasley, 1999; King, Keohane & Verba 1994). Locating the study in Pacific Northwest of Canada enables the lived experience of both Indigenous and Settler participants to be situated within the problematized context of continued settler colonialism to explore the perception and reality of the roles of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in the lived experiences of processes and practices of social citizenship. Thus, the units of analysis are the two CSOs organizations selected, both initially selected because they a) in the first case fulfill
the funding requirement and there is an established relational connection, and b) both are located in Canada and involved in social services or advocacy with Firsts Nations, Metis, and/or Inuit individuals, groups, and communities. The scope of case selection is further bound geographically for both practical reasons of cost and time but also because the Pacific Northwest is home to a diversity of Indigenous ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing with more than 60 percent of all Indigenous languages being only spoken here (Government of British Columbia, 2019). British Columbia and the Yukon Territory are also largely unceded Indigenous territories and each case provides, in the context of continued settler colonialism, specific Indigenous ways of asserting self-determination, i.e. a title case and a land settlement agreement. Neither CSO has been previously studied to explore how their social service or advocacy facilitates or hinders the lived experience of social citizenship in this context. Each case is also an example of the first social service or advocacy of its kind focused on literacy equity with an Indigenous community, in the first case Tl’esqox is the first library learning centre in the Write to Read BC project and Dusk’a is the first to have the YCDC embedded in their centre.

This design allows also for inferences with regard to the real or imagined successes and failures through thematic and narrative exploration of the lived experience of social citizenship. It allows me to highlight interesting or intervening variables – in this case the notions of citizenship as spirituality and the gendered and generational aspects of knowledge production – as I move from the deductive theoretical prepositions to the inductive process of data analysis within each case and across cases (Yin, 2014; George & Bennett, 2004; Kaarbo & Beasley, 1999; King, Keohane & Verba 1994). By selecting these two cases, I must reflexively acknowledge the biases such purposeful section creates and how it may affect my ability to make causal inferences through process-tracing the means, motives, and opportunities for enacting social citizenship processes and practices in each case; this is done in detail in chapter four.

Using multiple data sources, the aim is to determine the inferences that can be made about the role of civil society organization in the lived experience of social citizenship of Indigenous or Settler individuals, groups, and communities in abject space through thematic and process-tracing analysis techniques. The two cases selected were in different Canadian jurisdictions and focus on two (First Nations and Canadian) of the four categories of citizens (Canadian, First Nations, Inuit, and Metis). The first is in the province of British Columbia and the second is in the territory of the Yukon. Purposive or criterion sampling allows me to focus on relevant features that allow for the selection of a sample population selected for a
specific reason (Ritchie, et al., 2014; Kovach, 2009; Somekh & Lewin, 2005). Case selection is purposive, relational, and based on a variation of the lived experience of social citizenship at the meso level (province vs. territory), the status level (status under the Indian Act vs Land Settlement Agreement), geography (located in the Pacific Northwest), the CSO service delivery level (either had a specific Indigenous program or provided services to all citizens in the geographic area including within an Indigenous community or organization) and at the epistemological and ontological foundation level of citizenship (Settler and Tšilhqot’in, Kwanlin Dün or urban Indigenous). This research enables exploration of what these potential sites of interaction tell us about whose knowledge counts by looking at: interlocking oppressions, power, and agency; processes and practices of social citizenship; and, privilege and marginalization.

This comparative case study also allows for the exploration of these two CSOs as not only sites of research on social citizenship but also as site of social citizenship through the texture and particularities of enacting, embodying, and emplacing, or not, citizen actions and organizational values. It also highlights the importance of context, methodology, and caution in developing best practices versus place-based practices. The aim is to centre abject or marginalized voices to explore ways that CSOs facilitate or hinder social citizenship processes and practices, thus highlighting met and unmet needs. Citizenship is often perceived as the right to have rights, and (non)citizens have no access to the systems of rights, like laws, and where citizenship is undefined or defined as ‘other’, or abject, discrimination and racism flourish. When a (non)citizen is abjectified or not valued there is no control of legitimizing knowledge production, thus the aim, the work of this research, is to centre these voices in this production of knowledge. There is power in creating space where the abject (non)citizen is a legitimate knowing agent.

1.5 Limitations of the study

In this dissertation I am able to focus on two of four citizenship categories, First Nations (Indigenous) and Canadian (Settler) and therefore this research does not include the lived experience of perceptions of Inuit and Metis citizens. Just over a third of the Indigenous population surveyed identify as Metis (32.3 percent). Also, the data collected shows that in Nunavut people who identify as Aboriginal comprise the largest share of the overall population (Statistics Canada, 2011). The context of Canada allows for an exploration of all the variations of citizenship created by the legal definitions of the dual governing legislation discussed previously. Also, by including all three current legal delineations of Indigenous peoples in Canada, i.e. First Nations, Inuit, and Metis, in the dissimilar research design would
allow for an exploration of variation of Indigenous citizenship that would not be possible in another context, i.e., New Zealand, Australia or United States. Other limitations to this research are linked to funding initially received. Funding requirements and restrictions: the research must be done in Canada; one of the 'cases' must be the Write2Read project and must include Tl’ésqóx (Toosey) as one of the sites; and include participation of Indigenous peoples within Canada.

1.6 Definitions of key terms
Definition of key terms for the purposes of this research are generated from a review of the theoretical literature; see chapter three for a more detailed journey of their development.

*Abjection or marginalization* is defined by and seen in the limited spaces of rights, inclusion and belong (Tyler, 2013; Smith, 2012; Young, 2000; LaForest, 1998).

*Civil society* as the space between the state, market, and family life where citizens or competing social groups can negotiate, deliberate, or debate about the common good and the process of civil action (reconstruction) can occur. This space between is argued to be a nested space of citizen-based praxis, sociohistorical context, and the lived experience of citizens and (non)citizens.

*Civil society organizations* (CSOs) for the purposes of this research are defined as requiring skills, means, and power to promote shared ideas. They are a spatial social phenomenon that create a space in which all social actors have a voice towards self-determination of their own well-being. CSOs are also non-governmental, represent public interest, are able to influence state actors and public opinion, and have the capacity to organize alternative associations and discourses through a spectrum of advocacy and service or the distribution of resources.

*Continued settler colonialism* is not colonialism, but instead is defined here using the work of Wolfe (2006), Veracini (2015; 2010) and Lowman and Barker (1025). It requires a sovereign displacement to generate a new people, a Settler society. It is also a structure not an event and needs an abject exogenous other, a permanent occupancy, and is permanently unfinished.

*Indigeneity* is defined here as ‘the ways being’ of an Indigenous people, i.e., the ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. Indigeneity is found in the teachings, stories, laws, ceremonies and spiritual processes and practices, and place-based acts or actions tied to the
land that honour the ancestors and generations yet to come (Wosk Centre for Dialogue, 2012; Hunt, 2013; Clark, 2012). Principles of indigeneity are: *indigenous difference, indigenous rights, indigenous belonging, indigenous self-determination, and indigenous spirituality* (Fleras & Maaka, 2010). These principles are based on the interconnectedness and interrelatedness of Indigenous ontologies, epistemologies, ontologies, and methodologies that inform and legitimize how power and agency are enacted, embodied, and emplaced.

*Indigenous* for the purposes of this research will utilize Wilson (2008) definition: “inclusive of all first peoples – unique in our own cultures – but common in our experience of colonialism and our understanding of the world” (p.16).

*Intersectional indigeneity approach* is defined for the purposes of this dissertation as lived, practiced, and relational heterogeneity of Indigenous narratives and worldviews as seen in the intersects of principles of *indigenous difference, indigenous rights, indigenous belonging, indigenous self-determination, and indigenous spirituality* (Hunt 2013; Fleras & Maaka, 2010) and also interlocking oppressions, power and agency via the intersects of race or ethnicity, gender, class, colonization, and in this research ability and age too.

*Paradigm* is defined as the shared ontologies, underlying the epistemologies, axiologies, and methodologies, the ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing in the lived experience of social citizenship.

*Privilege* is defined as the agency of choice regarding the social, cultural, economic, and political resources available (and *abject* as the limited, impeded or lack of said agency of choice).

*Settler* refers to Canadian citizens descended from the colonial population, together with contemporary immigrants to Canada.

*Social citizenship* pulling elements from Kymlicka (2012), Smith (2012), Isin & Nielson (2008), Lister (2003), and Young (2000) is conceptualized as a process of critical synthesis of its institutional (status and rights) and social construction (practice and participation) aspects found with the acts or agency of citizens and (non)citizens rooted in space, place, and recast or reimagined over time. I argue it is also nested in the sociohistorical context and lived experience of citizens.
The Indian Act 1876, a piece of federal legislation passed that governs most aspects of life on Indian reserves in Canada. “Status” is a term used to refer to those who are recognized by the federal government as “Indian” for the purposes of the Indian Act; status refers to Indigenous people of Canada that are First Nations, Inuit, and Metis. The British North American Act 1867 was enacted by the British Parliament (and could only be changed there) until 1982 when the Canadian Constitution was patriated, only then are domestic amendments possible.

Uncolonize (Un/decolonize), will be used for Settlers peoples, groups, and communities, and is defined as a value laden phenomenon that require commitment and action in order to centre Indigenous voices, processes and practices, and as Rodriguez (2020) argues “the voluntary distancing, detaching from colonial [mores]”; and ‘decolonize’ will be used for Indigenous peoples, groups, and communities.

1.7 Chapter Outlines

What we now call Canada provides a context to explore continued settler colonialism and the interlocking oppressions, power, and agency. The Pacific Northwest provides us with a space to challenge, counter, and deconstruct settler-centric knowledge production and nation building narratives. It enables the exploration of contested tools and mechanisms to consider the political, social, and legal conditions in which they are enacted, embodied, and emplaced within this re-problematized context of continued settler colonialism. Centring abject voices in this context also enables the exploration of enacted, embodied, and emplaced social action that can inform solutions that does not further impede, abject, or colonize.

Chapters two, three, and four lay out why Canada, and specifically why the Pacific Northwest, is where the research is focused. The re-problematized context also provides the space to analyze contested narratives that centre Indigenous voices and ways of being. The Tŝilhqot’ín Nation and the Kwanlin Dün Nation are spaces to explore contested tools of policy and mechanisms used in recognition, reestablishment, and revival like the land settlement agreements or land title cases. Chapter two situates the case within the sociohistoric context and space of the Pacific Northwest to begin the exploration of the historic condition of and to contextualize the effects of continued settler colonialism on the lived experience of social citizenship processes and practices. This telling or snapshot of the sociohistorical context and conditions centres Tŝilhqot’in and Kwanlin Dün voices beginning with precontact to the current intertwined relationship within a contested coexistence. Chapter three will provide a review of the theoretical literature of settler colonialism,
citizenship, abjection, civil society, and civil society organizations. Based on the previous two chapters, chapter four makes the case for contesting the ‘how’ of elite knowledge extraction by challenging settler-centric research methodologies and making a case for an intersectional indigeneity approach and mixed-qualitative methods for this comparative case study. The next three empirical chapters will then provide the in case and across case analysis, interpretations, and comparisons. Chapters five and six lay out each case respectively as each civil society organization is explored as both a site of research on social citizenship and as site of social citizenship. Chapter five focuses on the interactions of Indigenous and Settler citizen at the sites of Rotary International’s Write to Read BC project in what is now called the Province of British Columbia and the Tšílhqot’ín Nation via the communities of Tl’ésqóx and Tl’étinqóx. Chapter six focuses on the same but in what is now called the Territory of the Yukon and Kwanlin Dün First Nations via the Yukon Child Development Centre and the Dusk’a Headstart Centre. Chapter six then provides the comparative analysis of the two cases based on the thematic analysis of each case. Thus, the next chapter begins the research journey by exploring the socio-historic context of each place of exploration.
Chapter Two: Socio Historic Context of the Spaces and Places of Exploration

2.1 Socio Historic Context of Two Places in Pacific Northwest

Green argues that how a citizen frames or reframes their perception of themselves “is an expression of one’s location in inter-generational histories and relationships” (2009: 43). The previous chapter set the scene for the research and this chapter builds the argument for locating it within the Pacific Northwest with the re-problematized context of continued settler colonialism. This chapter will focus on the two places, the spaces for this research: what is now called British Columbia and the Yukon. As the aim is to centre marginalized voices and lived experiences, the first part of this chapter on the socio-historic context of both places will also follow suit and be from the Tšilhqot’in and Kwanlin Dün perspective to situate the reader in the circumstance that necessitate the re-problematized context of continued settler colonialism. Therefore, before mapping out the theoretical perspectives and framework in chapter three, this chapter begins by setting the scene and then exploring historical conditions that lead to the theoretical choices of this dissertation in the spaces and places of these two case studies. The chapter will provide a brief history of both the Tšilhqot’in and Tagish Kwan, European arrival, the local impacts of colonial logics and legacies, and the judicial and negotiation approaches utilized as a way to contextualize the literature review and theoretical perspectives, use of the social dimension of citizenship, abjection or marginalization, and civil society to explore the research questions within these places and spaces. Doing so also enables the CSOs under exploration to be placed within this socio-historic context at the beginning of each empirical chapter. This allows for examination in later chapters of how the presented historical conditions in this chapter influence, or not, the lived experience of participants’ perspectives of social citizenship, knowledge production of social citizenship processes and practices, and the potential space between of CSOs and relational interactions between people and institutions.

2.1.1 Tšilhqot’in ~ A brief history

“For countless generations before the arrival of settlers, the ?Esggidam, ancestors of the Tšilhqot’in, thrived in the Chilcotin as powerful nations, guided by the wisdom of their legends and the laws” (Tšilhqot’in, 2016). This is the time when Thunderbird created the world; the time Raven stole the light creating day and night; and the time of Lendix’tcuz and his three sons. These transformers or tricksters who could change from dog to human, Lendix’tcuz and his three sons, are the ones who “go and visit the Chilcotin country” (Farrand, 1900) and their relational action transform the land, the water, and the animals
making it safe for the people to follow before turning to stone (Joyce Charleyboy, Personal Communication, 2021). Relational responsibilities continue to be taught through these and other stories or teachings as they carry collective knowledge of place-based responsibilities, laws, and ceremonies. Considering these different forms or territorial relations in this Indigenous cultural setting, I have included a map of how the territory is currently being re-defined through the discourse of cartography to show how and where it is situated in the west of what is now called the Province of British Columbia’ interior region, also referred to as the Cariboo Chilcotin (see Map section, figure 1). As shown on the map, the Tŝilhqot’in people comprise a nation that currently has six communities formed under and governed by the Indian Act 1876 with a total population of 3,445 registered members that include designated reserve lands: Ḑēšdilàng (Alexandria – 179 members), Tl’éšqón (Toosey – 310 members), Tl’éťinqón (Anaham – 1495 members), Tsidëdëdël (Alexis Creek – 634 members), Yūnēšíst’in (Stone – 417 members, and Xēni Gwét’in (Nemiah – 410 members). These reserves currently comprise only a portion of the land of the traditional territory the nēnqàyní have utilized since the time of ḨEsggidam.

The Tŝilhqot’in refer to themselves as the nēnqàyní, ‘a person or the people of the earth’ who speak nēnqàyní ch’ih, the language of the land, or ‘in the Indigenous way’ (Smith, 2008: 9). They are a part of the larger language family group of Dene or Athabaskan speaking Indigenous peoples of North America. When greeting outsiders, and to distinguish themselves from their Nuxalk, Secwepemc and Dene ènáy/èná, ‘neighbors’, they continue to this day to introduce themselves as Tŝilhqot’in, “a person of the river” (ibid: 10) and include details of genealogy (parents and grandparents) and what area/community they are from. For the most part Tŝilhqot’in are known to have friendly relations with their Indigenous neighbors, but recurring conflict over territorial resources, protocols, and laws did occur (Hewlett, 1973). As Dinwoodie (2010) postulates, the way they act and are treated by others “in the historical record requires that we recognize some form of political solidarity” (p.653).

The ḨEsggidam lived in pit houses, maintained trail networks, and participated in seasonal rounds (Tŝilhqot’in Nation v. British Columbia, 2007: 146, 370, 897; Weir, 2013). Seasonal rounds are an example of Tŝilhqot’in peoples understanding of the cosmos, their spiritual connection to the land and all living things as interconnected and interrelated. This specialized knowledge developed over generations of space and time, of the places to come together, to set down laws, to participate in ceremony, to tell stories or to teach, to gather what resources during what season from within their traditional territories. It demonstrates
how highly attuned this connection to the land was and continues to be today as people continue to follow the seasonal rounds being guided by the land’s ever-changing cycles. Tšilhqot’in have established trade routes, later referred to as the Grease Trail, which moved oolichan oil from the coast through their territory. Tšilhqot’in stories tell of how the ṭEsggidam comprised healthy and strong individuals and communities that form a Nation rich in culture and with a deep spiritual connection to the land of their territory that is said to extend to ‘time immemorial’, the time of sadanx gwenig, of Tšilhqot’in legends. The recordings of their laws are found in the names of places and stories of events, how they “shape the lives of the Tšilhqot’in people…provid[ing] substance and meaning to the life of a Tšilhqot’in person” (Tšilhqot’in Nation v. British Columbia, 2007: 131). Thus, linguistic, archaeological, and Tšilhqot’in oral history offer no fixed date within the Settler metaphysical logic of time for the assumed nènqàyní move to their lands of current occupation from the northwestern regions where the Athabaskan language group holds more prominence. Matson and Mange (2007) demonstrate how archaeological evidence can be found of this continued migration northwest, and with the exception of the overlapping territories with their ènáy/ená, there is little question of the longevity in their lands of the Tšilhqot’in.

In many conversations with Tšilhqot’in Elders and Knowledge Keepers⁴ over more than a decade of working within the Nation, all have spoken of how the Tšilhqot’in traditional ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing are done in relations with the land, water, four-legged, winged and finned and in accordance with the seasons. They teach stories or teaching, a peoples collective knowledge production, is about sharing Tšilhqot’in responsibilities and shared accountabilities with their relations, kin, and neighbors to the land and all their relations in creation. It is about sharing ways of knowing and doing, ways of respect, and laws that are geographically situated via place names and through said teachings or stories. Academic usage of the term “nomadic” or semi-nomadic to describe Dene societies is thus seen as problematic by Tšilhqot’in Knowledge Keeper Joyce Charleyboy, who is also on the Tšilhqot’in Women’s Council. Joyce emphatically states “We are not nomadic! My etsu [grandmother] has issues around being [externally labelled] nomadic” (Personal Communication, 2020). Labels are powerful political tools, and as Retzlaff (2005)

---

⁴ Being an Elder or Knowledge Keeper is not defined by age, but by community recognition, earned respect, and demonstrated wisdom, harmony, and balance.
states “refusing to wear externally constructed and imposed labels is one form of resistance and thus one form of resisting hegemonic power structures” (p.620).

The Tšilhqot’in, like many Indigenous people who built complex societies in accordance with seasonal rounds, have a relational territorial epistemology and ontology that means the boundaries of their territory are fluid in light of overlaps with their ènáy/ená (neighbours), are determined by fluid kinship relations based on shared resources, and are linked to their spiritual connections to certain areas or places of cultural or spiritual significance (Joyce Charleyboy, 2020, Personal Communication; Shawnee Palmantier MacGregor, 2020, Personal Communication; Wellburn, 2012; Thom, 2009; Smith, 2008). Accordingly, Tšilhqot’in Knowledge Keeper and legal scholar Shawnee Palmantier MacGregor informs me that in relations to Tšilhqot’in governance, “We definitely weren’t just roaming around will-nilly. We exercised governance, jurisdiction, management of law, and resources during the seasonal rounds. We followed not only our Dechan Ts’edilhtan but also observed and followed the land’s law and the laws of animals as well. It was about balance and the relationships we have with everything around us” (Personal communication, 2020). This fluidity, as legal scholar Henderson argues, shows how Indigenous ‘worldviews and relational connections to the land are understood “not as acts of imagination, but a series of teachings about a particular place and about the proper way to relate to a whole irrevocable ecosystem” (2002: 45). Seasonal rounds allow for seasonal gathering of families into larger groups to share stories, teachings and participate in ceremony or other social processes and practices at specific site in Tšilhqot’in territory. These became sites of fur trading posts or Indigenous villages (Lutz, 2008; Swanky, 2012, Birchwater, 2017). These seasonal and site-specific social actions also include the coming together for legal negotiations and law making. As stated in the Tšilhqot’in Nation’s Nulh Ghah Dechen Ts’edilhtan (2019) – Tšilhqot’in Nation Wildlife Law – the Dechen Ts’edilhtan is literally “laying down the stick” and is related to the English term “law”. The act of “laying down the stick” is the traditional the symbol of reaching consensus via collective negotiation and discussion, once a decision was reached the stick was laid down and the decision became law. It became a part of the governance process the Tšilhqot’in have orally passed down generationally and continue to live by. They are seen as part of what binds Tšilhqot’in as a people and are considered here to be the “laws of our relations”, relation to self, to collective, to the land and to all living things. “We have occupied our ancestral nen since time immemorial. Our identity is bound to our nen” (ibid:2); nen is Tšilhqot’in for land. These laws shape Tšilhqot’in peoples lived experience and are silenced no more but are remerging, being shared internally and
externally, and are being written down so they can be applied to the current context and relations with ènáy/èná and Settlers; this will be further discussed below.

Elders speak of the different system of councils in Tšilhqot’in society as they understood human nature and the necessity of the role of keeping the peace. From these societies formed a council of leaders who had processes regarding problem solving, establishing equity, and enforcing justice based on the rules of respect and an understanding of the land. This understanding of the land is based on the permanent connection to it that is seen as a form of power, a way to keep the peace, and a way to foster unity. Ceremony is all of this in action, a way to tap into the interconnectedness to and interrelatedness of all of creation and a way of asserting the laws that are a part of the land as a form of place based relational responsibility and accountability. Ceremony is thus the enactment of this spiritual connection with the land and all living things as teachings are given in specific places to reinforce these stories, responsibilities, and laws. This spiritual awareness in the Tšilhqot’in worldview meant there was also a society of deyen, powerful and gifted individuals, transformers, and tricksters, whose relationship with supernatural, land, and plant-based knowledge enables them to cure illness, place spells or good or bad energy, and perform ceremony and place specific spiritual processes and practices.

2.1.2 Tagish Kwan – a brief history

Human communities continue through their stories. These stories in the territory now called the Yukon are the “contested ways people invoke the past to talk about the present and the present to talk about the past” (Cruikshank, 1998: 2-3). The ideological narrative of Canada contains within this undefined notion, the symbolism, of being of the ‘north’, a notion that is both linked to our historical identity and continues to forge our present perception of said identity. However, Yukoners would contest this identity as solely the perception of the “south” and would instead point to their historic (and current) lived experience of the ‘ignorance and neglect’ of the actual north by the rest of Canada. A view also contested by the Indigenous inhabitants whose homeland has been in what is now referred to as the Yukon Territory for millennia. Paradoxically, the last area of North America to be colonized by Europeans, it is considered to be an area first explored by humankind during the last ice age somewhere between 35,000 – 14, 500 years ago (Coates & Morrison, 2005). Archaeological evidence and glacial science indicate that settlements and sustained human occupation was most likely possible following the last glacial advance in southern Yukon around 10-12,000 years ago (Greer, 1993); this is the time the Elders speak of when Crow made the world (Hare & Greer, 1994).
Ancestors of the Indigenous peoples of what is now called the Yukon Territory likely arrived earlier in this period and are known as the Dene or as members of the Athabaskan language family. As these early arrivals settled the land, lifestyles and cultures arose that were dependent on an evolving resource base that continues to contribute to the current diverse and vibrant cultures of Indigenous peoples of this land. This diversity has expanded to incorporate eight distinct languages from two language families, Athabaskan (Gwich’in, Hän, Upper Tanana, Northern and Southern Tutchone, Kaska, and Tagish) and Tlingit. Traditionally, Athabaskan social and political organization was flexible as participation in seasonal rounds depends on the resources available that demonstrates the ability of families and matrilineal clans to disperse and regroup (Cruikshank, 1990). Seasonal rounds here continue to be known as the traditional patterns of travelling to specific resources areas to hunt, fish, preserve, and cache, a similar way of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing that are spaciotemporal processes and practices tied to the land. Similar to other Athabaskan groups, this relational territorial epistemology and ontology means boundaries between language groups are also fluid as they are based on kinship relationships and shared resources. Social and political organization traditionally was also based on two matrilineal kinship divisions, the clans of Wolf and Crow that follow exogamous marriage practices. This organizational principal, also referred to as a moiety, follows the protocol that Wolf and Crow people have to marry people from the opposite clan (Cruikshank, 1990; First Nations Programs and Partnerships Unit, 2013; Ives, 1990). However, traditional laws governing these clans lay out the specific rights and responsibilities of individuals and families; many of these laws are similar but there are also distinct differences for each based on traditional language areas of settlement (First Nations Programs and Partnerships Unit, 2013).

The headwaters of the Chu Nínkwän (Yukon River), in what is now the location of Whitehorse was called K’wan’dlln and is the traditional territory of the Tagish Kwan people whose descendants now form the Kwanlin Dün First Nations and Ta’an Kwach’an Council (see Map section, figure 2). Archaeological excavations conducted at Annie Lake (in 1982 and 1992) and Fish Lake (in 1993) produced evidence of seasonal hunting and fishing camps that are approximately 5000 years old (Council of Yukon First Nations, 2011; Greer, 1993). At the Fish Lake site, the continuity between oral history and archeological evidence demonstrates how this site has been used as part of the traditional seasonal rounds for more than 5000 years by the ancestors of Kwanlin Dün and continues to be used as traditional camps by Elders (Gothardt & Hare, 1994). Archaeological evidence also supports the oral traditions of the ancient trade networks and travel routes (Gothardt & Hare, 1994).
K’wan’dlln home of the Tagish Kwan was also a regular meeting place for other Indigenous people who come to trade, hunt, and fish. The Tagish Kwan seasonal rounds also incorporated the migratory patterns of the game and fur-bearing animals used for clothing and trade. In particular, the Coastal Tlingit made trade trips to the interior both prior to and after the Europeans came to trade coastal resources for these furs. This led to marriages, long standing interrelations, cultural sharing, and then development of interior Tlingit permanent settlement (Hare & Greer, 1994).

The Tagish Kwan’s moiety and clan affiliations guided behaviour, and these protocols of Wolf and Crow clans influence ceremonies, reproduce labour division based on age, gender and kinship ties, and intergenerational knowledge sharing (Cruickshank, 1990:10). This type of knowledge production highlights the role of Elders then (and now) and the social expectation that Elders are sources of authority and as such ought to behave as knowledge keepers and share teachings, history, protocols, and laws. Throughout the year, seasonal gathering of families into larger groups allowed for further knowledge production in the intense social rounds of activities (games, ceremonies, and raids of others) along major rivers or lakes; these too became sites of fur trading posts or Indigenous villages (Coates & Morrison, 2005: 12). Intensely spiritual, the Tagish Kwan, like many Indigenous peoples, had a worldview filled with an awareness of the spiritual and spiritual forces and many moieties and clans often had shamans whose relationship with supernatural enables them to cure illness, place spells, and bring good luck (ibid: 12-14).

It is into these rich socio-political contexts of interrelated, spiritually grounded, matrilineal, interconnected land based Indigenous communities and Nations that the demands of the international fur trade and then gold that drove Europeans further into the Interior and further north into these spaces and places.

2.2 European Arrival

Prior to Europeans arrival in the Pacific Northwest in what is now British Columbia and the Yukon, a few key moments in history are first considered to help situate their arrival in North American and in the later formation of these colonies in the Pacific Northwest before exploring the impact of their arrival in each place. In the 1400s a series of Papal decrees of Pope Alexander declared the right to convert, enslave, and colonize that initiated what will become know as European’s Age of Discovery. This Doctrine of Discovery demonstrates how the Catholic Church legitimizes the “invading of non-Christian territories and claiming sovereignty therein” (Reid, 2010: 338). As a result, ‘discovery claims’ were made by Nations like Portugal, Spain, Britain, France as they all agreed to two things Reid
claims, “(i) the pope’s primary authority to grant sovereignty, and (ii) the assumption that Indigenous peoples lost underlying title to their land” (ibid:339). This allowed each nation to ‘lay claim’ to land and resources in the name of their respective Crowns. It also led to the legal concept of ‘terra nullius’; a concept that lays out how land held by non-Europeans or non-Christians is empty land and they had a Christian duty to claim it. Conflicting claims led to the Seven Years War between Britain and France that ended in the Treaty of Paris and the subsequent Royal Proclamation of 1763. This document set “out the guidelines for European settlement of Indigenous land in North America…affirmed under British laws Indigenous title in North America…until it was ceded to the British Crown by treaty” Birchwater, 2017:6). It was still law when British explorers made their way to the Pacific Northwest.

2.2.1 Formation of British Columbia and the Tšilhqot’in War

In 1793 Alexander Mackenzie crossed overland from Montreal and reached the Pacific Ocean at what is now Bella Cola, thus setting the stage for European arrival and the colony of British Columbia. In fact, in a calculated and pre-emptive move against American gold miners claims to land, the British Crown “simply laid claim to the entirety of what is today mainland British Columbia, declaring it a colony in 1858” (Lowman & Barker, 2015;12) despite the law set forth in the Royal Proclamation of 1763. This set the scene for a regime change that is often portrayed by historians as peaceful, nonviolent, and cooperative. However, the counter hegemonic narrative shows how the Crown did not follow its own laws nor use the established diplomatic tools or treaties in creating this colony illegally. Since 1814, when European fur traders with the Hudson’s Bay Company came to what is now know as the Cariboo Chilcotin region, Settler relations with the Tšilhqot’in are “tenuous, unpredictable, and often dysfunctional…emblematic of Tšilhqot’in independence and resistance to Settlers’ expectations of conducting business” (Myers-Ross, 2007). Despite this struggle to build good relations, the Cariboo Gold Rush of the 1850s brought people of European descent to the territories to stay. Settlers build ranches and coopt land to build roads to transport gold, while missionaries came to convert the “heathens” which leads to a form of ethnic cleansing from smallpox, war, and tenuous coexistence (Swanky, 2012; Wellburn, 2012; VanStone, 1993; Hewlett, 1973). In examining both Settler and oral accounts, the Chilcotin War Lutz (2004) argues is not just an example of Indigenous people being unable to resist the force of colonial power as it has been historically present, of law over savagery. He states “…the reverse is truer. The colonial government drove itself into insolvency financing this $80, 000 operation. It captured only five of the twenty-five implicated in the operations – and those by deception. The road was stopped. Europeans left the Tšilhqot’in in
charge of their territory for another half century and smallpox did not return...and the colonial government adopted policies to avoid Indian confrontations…” (ibid: 8). The impact of the Chilcotin War was not just localized but also sets the scene for the formation of the colony of British Columbia and the historic and current relations across the province. I have also been told that this is the first story and lasting lesson that is taught to all Tšilhq’ot’in children by their families. It highlights the differing perspectives and relations between Settlers and Tšilhq’ot’in nènqàyñí (people) as well as the inherent historical environment of mistrust that still permeates current relations. “The Chilcotin War is what defines us,” says Chief Joe Alphonse, (Personal Communications, 2016).

By the 1860s, a shorter route from gold deposits to market was proposed by entrepreneur Alfred Waddington to move gold through Tšilhq’ot’in territory to Bute Inlet and then onto Victoria via steamship. Permission was sought from colonial leadership in Victoria and consent was given for a road crew to be sent into the territory to begin construction (Lutz, 2008; Hewlett, 1973). The road crew were employed by Waddington to build a road from the coast through the Homathko River valley and across the Chilcotin Plateau towards Puntzi Lake and the Quesnel River. Waddington, the road crew, nor the Governor sought nor were they given permission by the Tšilhq’ot’in to enter their territory. As Tšilhq’ot’in National Chief Joe Alphonse puts it, “if you come into Tšilhq’ot’in territory, you had to have Tšilhq’ot’in permission. And when the Waddington road-building crew came in, they didn’t get that permission. And when they took our women, abused our women, we declared war on them” (quoted in Omand, 2018).

Referred to in the colonial record and archival records as the “Homathko Massacre”; however, it is always orally referred to and regarded as war. The stories of Chilcotin War since 1864 are taught to children by their families to ensure the Tšilhq’ot’in perspective of the warriors protecting the people and the land is not lost. From the colonial perspective there was the inherent right to build a road, as stated before Waddington received permission for the Crown representative, claimed it was an “unprovoked attack”, and was perceived as trickery, as murder, as a massacre (Lutz, 2008; Hewlett, 1973; 1964). Although we cannot know the exact reason for the Tšilhq’ot’in warriors’ actions in 1864, arguments have been put forth in both the colonial archival record and oral traditions for the following: the threat of more smallpox; the road crew was not invited into territory; the treatment of women; and, plunder due to the road crew not following the law of the land by sharing their abundance food. It is notable that the last was argued to be as a result of the first waves of smallpox.
which resulted in famine and starvation due to loss of skilled leaders, hunters, gatherers, and knowledge keepers. (Lutz, 2004; 2018; Hewlett, 1973, 1964; Taylor, 2018)

Regardless of the intention, the threat of spreading another wave of smallpox made by road crew member William Brewster was perceived by the Tšilhqot’in as an intentional threat. To put this into context, the previous year of 1862-1863 marked a very dark time in Tšilhqot’in history as smallpox came along with the outsiders and first settlers into the territory and wiped out roughly fifty percent, or more, of the Tšilhqot’in population, and their Indigenous neighbors, thus altering established kinship connections and former ways of social organization (Swanky 2012; Lutz, 2008; Myers-Ross, 2007). It is in this context that a second threat of renewed smallpox infection, triggered what was to become known as the Chilcotin War (Hewlett, 1973). Hopper’s (2018) article in the National Post states that under questioning after the war, Tšilhqot’in leader and warrior Lhats’asʔin (also referred to as Klatsassin) said, “A white man took all our names down in a book and told us we should all die,”; all who were there reported similarly and reported the Tšilhqot’in warriors felt war was necessary to prevent another existentially threatening tide of smallpox (see Swanky 2016, 2012).

Despite support within the archival records some feel the reframing of the ‘massacre’ to ‘war’ in accordance with the Tšilhqot’in perspective is rewriting history (see Rothenburger, 1973; 2018; Taylor, 2018:3). The reframing, Taylor (2018) argues is an attempt by “apologist” to see these “killers” as protectors of land and the people from the “deliberant attempt to wipe them out via another bout of smallpox” versus what he argues “we do know”, that a few not all Tšilhqot’in were “engaged in a campaign of bloodshed”. The effect of persistent settler colonial views allows for the settler-centric continuance of perception that colonial norms, traditions, legacies, and mechanism creates a “modern, diverse, and tolerant Canada” (ibid: 6).

The study of relationships during this period is also hampered by the fact that all written records of the time are written by white Settler males; therefore, I also weave in oral accounts as I have heard the telling of this war many times over the last decade. I offer a particular heartfelt thank you to Tšilhqot’in Knowledge Keeper Joyce Charleyboy, Knowledge Keeper and legal scholar Shawnee Palmantier, and to the Elders who testified in the Tšilhqot’in Nation v. British Columbia (2014) case. Elders’ testimonies and interviewing key woman in the Nation helps me go beyond the colonized and masculinized threads of history and also weave in the matriarchical threads of the war. Tšilhqot’in oral history gives two reasons for the outbreak of the initial violence and for the declaration of war on all
‘whites’ in the territory. Due to the smallpox decimation of the population, referred to as the ‘Great Dying’, many in the territory were struggling and on the brink of starvation which led to two events. First, the theft of supplies from the white road builders camp prompts the crew boss William Brewster to threaten to send smallpox back into Tšilhqot’in territory and kill them all (Myers Ross, 2007). Second, when a few young Tšilhqot’in girls came to the road crew to ask for food, they are told they’d be given food if they became prostitutes. When the girls refuse, it is alleged that the crew gang raped them, including the young daughter of Tšilhqot’in leader and warrior Lhats’asʔin. As a result, a small group of Tšilhqot’in warriors lead by Lhats’asʔin make their way to the ferry crossing site at Fort Alexander and kill the man in charge of the ferry, Tom Smith, making off with the supplies at the fort. They then make their way to the main road crew camp, where they joined the camp. “The white men did not suspect anything unusual was afoot, although the Indians had donned war paint and danced all night, their squaws sitting around in a circle watching them” (de Bertrand Lugrin, 1935: 53).

Waddington claimed the attack was unprovoked, despite the archival evidence and oral tradition and oral evidence given in the Tšilhqot’in v. British Columbia (2014) case that “the attacks” were done in accordance to known Tšilhqot’in laws and war practices in response to the road crews’ actions and threats (Hewlett 1964, Tšilhqot’in Nation v. British Columbia, 2014). Particularly gruesome is the death and mutilation of William Brewster in accordance with Dechen Ts’edilhtan (Tšilhqot’in law). For the crime of rape, he was punished, and his genitals were mutilated, mouth was slit, and heart hallowed out as a sign to all who saw his body of his offences (Rothenburger, 1973; Myers-Ross, 2007). In total, 21 white men were killed and authors like Rothenburger (1973) use descriptions like Brewster’s brutal death to show the ‘savagery’ of the Tšilhqot’in, who in turn use it as a cautionary tale regarding the consequences of breaking the Dechen Ts’edilhtan. Although we cannot know exactly what happened and why, this level of detail gives voice and ensures the counter narrative to the settler colonial one of massacre to the Tšilhqot’in one of “war not murder” is centred in order to demonstrate how it continues to influence relationships today. This accounting of the Tšilhqot’in oral history is also an example of the Dechen Ts’edilhtan in action, of the law of the land in action, and is an example of historic Tšilhqot’in agency and resilience.

The few white survivors of these attacks managed to relay the news back to Victoria, and they were quickly dubbed a massacre by the Victoria Daily Chronicle and Daily British Colonist. As a result, a small militia of 65 men is commissioned and sent into the territory to
find the ‘offending’ Tšilhqot’in men and bring them to justice. The militia is unsuccessful, and the only resulting death was of one of their own party. Eventually, Lhats’asʔin and the other seven leaders and warriors, referred to in the colonial record and now as ‘war chiefs’, agree to come and negotiate peace with the government. Fearing colony wide uprising, the government used subterfuge and shackles and arrests these leaders and warriors while they slept. Governor Seymour then has the war chiefs tried by Judge Mathew Begbie. They were found guilty of murder and hung. Lhats’asʔin is recorded as saying, “We meant war, not murder”.

Still considered heroes today, these seven leaders and warriors are emblematic of Tšilhqot’in pride, resistance, and distrust of Settlers. The impacts of the Chilcotin War continue to reverberate in the entangled existence and from historic to current relations, interactions, and intersections across what is now called British Columbia.

2.2.2 European Arrival: Fur & Gold

Cruikshank argues that to suggest Indigenous people in what is now called the Yukon were or are members of “mutually exclusive social or culturally groups would be misleading”; membership is flexible in composition and recruitment (1990: 5). In the late nineteenth century, this blurring of cultural and linguistic boundaries is further intensified by the demands of the international fur trade markets. As mentioned in the previous section, the Tlingit played a major role, solidifying their position as ‘middlemen’ in this trade with the arrival of the Russians in the 1740s and the British in the 1770s as they strictly used their kinship relations via arranged marriages in the interior to control rates and routes of trade to and from the coast to the interior (Hare & Geer, 1994). The Tagish Kwan in turn controlled the rates and routes of trade throughout the interior and north as K’wan’dlln was a site of gathering for hunting, fishing, and trade for many other Indigenous people, including the Tlingit, Kaska, Tron’dék Hwéch’in, Gwich’in and Tutchone (Council of Yukon First Nations, 2011; Cruikshank, 1990). This adaptability to changing conditions, relational reciprocity, and making best use of the resources whether socially, culturally, politically, or economically enabled Tagish Kwan to deal with the direct and indirect impacts of this fur-trade economy as well as the ensuing discovery of gold (Cruikshank, 1990; 1992; 1998).

By the time the Russians sold Alaska to the United States of America in 1867, diseases brought by Europeans move inland from the coast. By the 1880-1890s an estimated half to two-thirds of the Tlingit and Tagish Kwan populations are wiped out due to devastating epidemics of smallpox, measles, and influenza brought by traders inland (Coates & Morrison, 2005; Cruikshank, 1992). Severe decreases in population meant that the Tlingit
ability to maintain their power and economic hegemony of the flow of trade, to continue to restrict access to the interior through trade partnerships solidified through moiety-based marriages, waned (Cruikshank, 1992; 1998). Despite the relational reciprocity that defines these lateral and generational relationships rooted in the land, the decreased demography creates the perfect environment for world events of 1896, the Klondike Gold Rush and the world depression, to coalesce with the larger process of the expansion of the new Canadian Settler state into the Pacific Northwest. Cruikshank’s (1992) narrative analysis of both written and oral accounts of the gold rush demonstrates how both accounts moralize the gold rush but are socially constructed to manipulate and recast the narrative of social processes and practices based on cultural narratives of either the individual (colonial/Settler) or of group integrity (Indigenous). In other words, the “struggle for hegemony” of the colonial rhetoric versus “resilience and the maintenance or reassertion of cultural autonomy” (ibid: 35).

The narratives of the Klondike Gold Rush demonstrate the significance of the socio-cultural context to understand the impacts to the land and people and how knowledge of this event is constructed through the lenses of race, space, and power central to the expansion of Canadian Settler colonialism into what is to become the Yukon territory. Environmentally, this event not only adversely altered the land, destroying wildlife, but the arrival of miners also brought disease that decimated Indigenous populations even further (Willis, 1997). This influx of people and economic activity alter the legal and socio-politically landscapes as more regional infrastructure is introduced (Cruikshank, 1992); for example, The Northwest Mounted Police (NWMP) were often the only representatives of the government (Coates & Morrison, 2005) until the Yukon Parliament is officially formed on June 13th, 1898. Prospectors also bring with them narratives of social hierarchy, self-transformation, and colonial notions of ‘other’ that enabled them to justify their hegemonic attitudes that moralize and recast Indigenous values into colonial ones allowing for increased power and domination (ibid). Gold is often a driver of colonial expansion and resource extraction. Coates and Morrison argue resource extraction is often used to justify the marginalization of Indigenous people and is the reason “why the Government of Canada did not sign a treaty with the Yukon First Nations… was that Ottawa did not want to have them choose land for a reserve on which gold might later be found” (2005: 115). Thus, for most Indigenous people the impacts of the Klondike Gold Rush on their traditional ways of life were multiple and intersecting from environmental, demographic, health, economic, and spiritual (via missionaries). This interrupted the harmony with which they had lived with the land for
centuries and continue to be felt in the years to come. In four short years the rush was over, an example of how boom and bust cycle economics can markedly shift the socio-political landscape of a space/place.

2.3 Colonial Logics, Legacies, and the Localized Impacts

The Indian Act 1876 consolidated all colonial laws affecting Indians in what was to become Canada. The localized impacts of internalized colonialism and the logics and legacies of both colonialism and continued settler colonialism leads to intergenerational trauma, the loss of language fluency, the capacity to live according to the laws and the land in relation, the passing down of skills, knowledge and material culture, the supressing of economies and food systems, and the silencing of cultural and spiritual norms, processes, and practices (Blaney, 2018; Smith, M., 2017; Cooke, 2016; TRC 2015; 2015a; Coulthard, 2014; Ladner; 2014; Edelman, 2012; Armstrong; 2011; Regan, 2010; Tsosie, 2010; Green, 2007; Milloy, 2006; Nadasdy, 2003). Impacts were numerous, at times individual and at times collective.

European settlement, the waning fur trade, and the effects of population decline due to diseases like smallpox results in a shift from the need for Indigenous labour to one of Settlers desire to access the land. “The intersection of political and economic interests, missionary ideology, and popular humanitarianism lay the foundation for the transformation of policy of conciliation to a policy of civilization in Canada during the 1800s” (Furniss, 1995: 20). There are varying degrees of privilege which foster socially constructed relations of oppression, intersections of class, gender, race, and power, that are components and conditions of the historical development of the country now called Canada (Abele and Stasiulis, 1989). Indigenous policy in the context of continued settler colonialism in what is now called Canada is argued to be one of protection, civilization, assimilation, and more recently one of cultural or political genocide (i.e., Tobias, 1991; Stasiulis and Yuval-Davis, 1995; Miller, 2004; Alfred, 2009; Simpson, 2004; 2001; TRC, 2015; Ladner, 2014). Saul (2015) asserts that the foundation for these views is found within the historical conditions of “exceptionalism” that is warped by notions of Social Darwinism and racial superiority in the second half of the nineteenth century. Social Darwinism emerges in the 1870s in Western Europe and is used to justify colonialism and in North America to justify settler colonialism; it acts as a justification for colonial logics and mechanism based on Darwinian laws of natural selection that are applied to individuals and groups of people. Foucault reminds us “it was on the basis of flamboyant rationality of Social Darwinism that racism was formulated” (Rabinow, 1984). In Atleo’s analysis, Darwinian Theory is seen to be interpreted and created “for colonizers, [as] a view of differences between people that was and is characterised by
superiority and inferiority”, a view that is used against Indigenous people (2011:96) as Social Darwinism turned differences into inferiorities. For example, Social Darwinism took the notion of ‘survival of the fittest’ and made it a moral right to justify industrial nations ‘conquering’ and ‘civilizing’ those they deemed ‘savage’, i.e., people of colour, as a way to justify colonialism and slavery. Social Darwinism’s most extreme form is eugenics, a racist pillar of Nazi Germany that resulted in the genocide of the Holocaust.

From this notion of Social Darwinism also stems the notion of protection, as the ‘Indian’ person and property need to be protected from the exploitation of the European settlers, and thus the ‘Indian’ is afforded ‘special status’ within the constitutional structure of Canada that is encoded through the British North America (BNA) Act of 1867 that legislatively makes Indigenous peoples non-citizens, effectively wards of the state (Furniss, 1995; Tobias, 1991). The BNA Act initiates the transfer of responsibility in previous treaties with Indigenous peoples from the British Crown to the colony, in essence a ‘cradle to grave’ set of rules, regulations, and directives (Stasiulis & Yuval-Davis, 1995). This and the subsequent Indian Act 1876 became the foundation of the hegemonic discourse that facilitate and justify colonialism in the first place – saving the ‘Indians’, civilizing them, and eventually assimilating them (Holmes, Hunt, & Piedalue, 2014; Hunt 2013; 2014). Unlike previous treaties that are negotiated jointly, the Indian Act is created and imposed without any consultation or input from Indigenous people. It legalizes and makes material colonial logics of exclusion through imposed European-style elections where only men could vote despite existing Indigenous governance structures where women are traditional leaders (Tsosie, 2010). The Indian Act also determines and defines who qualifies as Indian, and women were initially only granted ‘status’ through marriage and if they chose to marry a non-status man then they and their children lose their status. The lived experience of ‘status’ is complex and because it is externally determined and imposed it is seen as a form of erasure that became a part of the normalized violence embedded in the act inherent within the double discrimination of race and gender. The act also determines the creation of reserves, increasing access for settlers to the land as smaller and smaller parcels of land, a fraction of the size of traditional territories, are allocated to Indigenous communities. Settlers often claimed the best piece of land, and this meant that the rotational and sessional harvesting or stewardship practices of many Indigenous communities are no longer possible (Sellars, 2016), nor is access to some sacred and ceremonial sites. The Indian Act 1876 is continually amended and continues to be a gendered and racist piece of legislation that enforces socio-spatial processes.
that maintain social constructs of who belongs in what space. Ladner (2014), an Indigenous scholar, argues that the *Indian Act* is an instrument of political genocide.

The settler colonial instrument of Indian Residential Schools is the coherent enactment of the *Indian Act*’s policy objective of civilization and assimilation, thus representative of “the ‘forced transfer of children’ to another culture…through the imposition of contradictory and oppositional cultural and political values” (Ladner 2014: 230). The schools were in existence for well over a century and these paternalistic and racist institutions have a complex history of minimizing and undermining family ties and cultural relations over many successive generations (Regan, 2010; TRC, 2015). The intention of the legislated processes of assimilation, often labeled cultural genocide, is to ensure Indigenous people ceased “to exist as distinct legal, social, cultural, religious, and racial entities in Canada” (TRC, 2015: 1). There were 139 residential schools, and it is estimated that at least one hundred and fifty thousand Indigenous children, some as young as four, passed through a system of overwhelming cultural, psychological, and emotional harm and traumatic abuse.

**2.3.1 Entangled Existence and Colony of British Columbia**

Internal governance shifted following the Chilcotin War to transform what could be called a council of women and the “stick carriers” (those who were skilled mediators and responsible for ‘laying the stick down’ or setting the law) to the warrior’s council and finally to the patriarchally imposed *Indian Act* election system. These colonial logics and legacies continue to impact how Tśilhqot’in society is structured from the initial impact of foreign diseases like smallpox to the lasting ongoing impacts of the *Indian Act* and the legacy of Indian Residential School. Shared stories show how the continued impacts of intergenerational trauma of Indian Residential School legacy have taken an overwhelming cultural, psychological, and emotion toll as Tśilhqot’in societies, their socio-political systems, laws, language, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing in some cases have been silenced, mutated, and disrupted beyond recognition. Collectively traditions and ceremonies were also not fully lived but like language socio-political and spiritual processes and practices are still quietly and privately passed down generationally within some families and communities.

Supreme Court of British Columbia documents (Tśilhqot’in Nation v. British Columbia, 2007) support the perception by both Tśilhqot’in and Settlers that the Chilcotin War demonstrates coordinated leadership through a council of warriors to address the road crews breaking of the laws (rape, permission to enter, illegal possession of territory, failure to pay tolls). Stopping the settlers, the white road builders, was synonymous with the protection
of the nen (the land), an action in defence of the land and the law. “In addition to demonstrating the significant capacity of the Tšilhqot’in in collective action, the events of the Chilcotin War show the commitment of Tšilhqot’in to defending their ancestral lands and their way of life.” (ibid). It is during this time that there was a shift in leadership from the complex coming together of representatives from all the Tšilhqot’in societies, (i.e. Elders, women, knowledge and story keepers, hunters, warriors, negotiators & law makers, artisans, deyen) to “lay the stick down” in a collective consensus-based relational approach to law making in accordance with the laws of the land to the council of male warriors who were to become known as ‘war chiefs’ who came together to expel the road crew. The shared memory and the keenly felt injustice of the hanging of these war chiefs is also argued to be where an observable shift in Tšilhqot’in governance to a predominantly male only leadership and veneration of ‘the warrior’ as many felt they ‘were still at war with the Crown’.

Tsosie (2010) argues acculturation via colonial logics of supplanting Indigenous governance and judicial systems, i.e., only recognizing male leaders, has had substantial impacts on Indigenous women’s agency politically, culturally, and socially. This can be seen in the previous section as the colonial record is male centric and Crown representatives often refused to deal with female leaders. Patriarchal understanding of leadership is damaging to the internal Indigenous governance as it displaces the surviving matriarchical leaders. There is also a reported increase in violence and in outsiders marrying in and usurping matriarchical power.

Knowledge Keeper Joyce Charleyboy (Personal Communication, 2021) relays a story from her grandmother of the post smallpox influx of midugh, non-Tšilhqot’in, males into Nagwentl’un. Her grandmother told her a story of man who was to become Chief Anaham. He was said to come from the coast via Bela Cola, where contact with Europeans came earlier and he married a matriarch of the Nagwentl’un community. Joyce’s grandmother told her Anaham later beat this matriarch, her relative, to death while she was pregnant and as a result, under the law, he was given warning to leave or die. Anaham then went onto Tl’étinqox and married the community’s matriarch Todut, a second example of an outsider usurping power through marriage. Therefore, when the colonial search party arrived, despite the community telling Governor Seymour’s men numerous times that Todut was their leader,

---

5 This summary of the traditional governance structure(s) comes from participating in numerous governance ‘reawakening’ sessions with the Tšilhqot’in Nation Governments Governance Sub-Table from 2017-2020 and co-facilitating sessions with Governance Sub-Table Manager and Tl’esqox as part of the ‘Leadership Selection Law’ project that is reimagining and decolonizing notions of custom election codes in accordance with Tšilhqot’in Dechen Ts’edilhtan.
they insisted on speaking to the male ‘chief’; Anaham readily obliged them further shifting the power in adopting ‘male only’ leadership. Although this story is outside of this research, it is shared as another example of the racial and gender discrimination Tŝilhqot’in women faced and continue to face as a result of colonial logics, legacies, and imposed patriarchy. It is also shared as an example of how to redress the wrongs of colonial legacies of Canada by providing safe spaces for unheard and silenced voices to re-build an understanding of the value of women in communities by giving attention to women’s histories, their ways of knowing and doing. Unfortunately, this patriarchal shift in the Nation is further reinforced under the colonial legislation, the *Indian Act 1876* banned women from voting and running in imposed Chief and Council elections. According to Tsosie (2010), this shift is also in alignment with internalized colonialism and the historical policy of European nations in recognizing male political leaders only. Blaney (2018) argues it also silences, mutates and/or disrupts matriarchical systems and ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing to the point the patriarchy is “so ingrained in our communities that it is now seen as a ‘traditional trait’… [but in reality, is simply] ingrained sexism” (p.82).

After the hanging of the war chiefs’ external laws and legislations are imposed and colonial logics like the oppressions under the *Indian Act 1876* result in long-term poverty, marginalization and violence that is still being overcome today. These logics and external laws lead to dispossession of traditional territory, the Tŝilhqot’in nen, creating a disconnection to the land and the laws and capacity for lived Tŝilhqot’in citizenship as the silencing or muting of the culture and language were reinforced through the Indian Residential School system. Land dispossession for the Tŝilhqot’in people also means the segregation of the Nation into only six communities which are in some ways based on precontact kinship relations but ultimately determined, formed under, and governed by the *Indian Act 1876*. Also, in the Cariboo Chilcotin region, as in many other parts of Canada, the Indian Residential School system means the government partnered with the churches from the major denominations to ‘civilize’ and ‘educate’. Thus St. Joseph’s Mission was opened by the Catholic order of the Oblates in 1867 and officially becomes an Indian Residential School in 1886. Referred to as simply “the Mission” it remained open with Indigenous students in residence until 1981. I attended much of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission’s Public Sharing Hearings for survivors held in Williams Lake at Thompson Rivers University in May of 2013. My office, at that time, was outside the gym where the accounts were being given. It often became a refuge for myself, Residential School Survivors, and witnesses when the sharing of psychological, emotional, physical, and sexual
abuse became too much. I would serve tea, sit in silence, offer a chance to smudge, or just cry and hold onto those who needed it. In those shared moments of brave, real, and often blunt sharing, it became clear to me that there was nothing post about colonialism, that in fact it is an everyday lived experience for Indigenous peoples.

The institutionalized relationship between Indigenous and Settler citizens personified in the Indian Residential School legacy encodes and enables colonial beliefs of superiority to be legitimized with tragic consequences. Stories of paternalistic imposed spaces and places where language and cultural practices were forbidden as young children were forcibly separated from family and community (sibling were not allowed to speak with or comfort each other) lasting months at a time, are perceived to cause lifelong rifts between survivors, family members, and communities. Survivors share experiences of inadequate and often questionable food, harsh punishment, forced labour, and abuse that ranged from emotional, verbal to physical and sexual. As Regan states, the Indian Residential School system has “an intergenerational history of dispossession, violence, abuse, and racism that is a fundamental denial of the human dignity and rights of Indigenous peoples” and that “as Canadian citizens, we are ultimately responsible for the past and present actions of our government” (2010:4-5). Many survivors also speak keenly of continuing to feel the injustices of not being able to speak their language, learn their laws, skills (or passing down skills), and being able to practice their ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing on the land. The effects of these impacts are also reflected in success rates in current educational institutions as 50 percent of those living on reserve are more likely to drop out of high school with 14 percent of all Indigenous students’ still achieving lower reading rates than all other students in the local school district (Statistics Canada, 2016; Farrar, 2014). 7

Cultural silence and the intergenerational impacts of colonial legacies and logics create a long history of discrimination and the parallel counternarrative of resistance and resilience; once such counternarrative of continued resistance was a 30 plus year legal battle that will be discussed in section 2.4.1 as it also highlights the centrality of the land and the differences in Settler and Indigenous views of it. The connection between language and culture, and as postulated above to the land itself, implies a justification of the analytical shift to see the land as a “system of reciprocal relations and obligations” (Coulthard, 2014: 13).

6 A spiritual practice involving the burning of traditional medicines as a form of cleansing.
7 However, according to Shore (2019) due to the inclusion of Indigenous culture and history into curriculum “Indigenous graduation rates are up impressively in B.C., rising about eight per cent over the past five years to more than 69 per cent. The completion rate for all students is also at a historic high of 88.8 per cent in 2019.”
2.3.2 ‘Land of the Midnight Sun’: Intertwined Relationships and the Creation of the Yukon Territory

By the 1900s the economic implosion meant population rapidly declined in what is now called the Yukon Territory from roughly 40,000 in 1898 to barely 4,000 by 1921, and half of whom were Indigenous (Coates & Morrison, 2005: 118). Despite the small population, society at the beginning of the twentieth century was sharply defined along strict Eurocentric egalitarianism, social class, political alliances, and race. This combined with the resulting impacts of smallpox, colonial logics, and mechanism like the Indian Act and Indian Residential School, and the influxes and then exodes of Settlers and miners created spaces and places for both privilege and abjection.

Investments in infrastructure such as roads, railways, and riverboats enabled the movement of people and resources and situated Whitehorse as a transportation hub. However, the Yukon remained an economic and political outpost until the First World War; a place many people viewed as a space to get rich and flee from. After the war, the next twenty years were economically lean in the Yukon. In the mist of this post war economic uncertainty some gold fields prospered, and the fur trade remained stable; in turn, Indigenous peoples benefitted economically during this time utilizing their traditional knowledge of and ways of being, knowing, and doing on the land to ride out fluctuations in fur prices in the world economy (Coates & Morrison, 2005). That said, the cities of Dawson, Mayo, and Whitehorse were white Settler enclaves and continued to be racialized spaces where Indigenous people required permission to enter until the pass system ends with changes to the Indian Act; a discrimination disguised as protection on the path to assimilation. Missionaries and churches also play a significant role in post-rush Yukon, and despite the questioning of their usefulness by the state and church alike, the first Residential School was opened in Carcross in 1911 by the Anglican Church to aid in this goal of assimilation (ibid).

The Residential School legacy in the Yukon is similar to the experiences in British Columbia and the rest of Canada as discussed previously. However, because of the difference in the demographics of the North, a proportionally higher number attended, and thus the per capita impacts of implementation of this particular Indian Act acculturation process are higher in the territories (TRC, 2015: 67). Published or scholarly writings of the lived experiences of Residential School and Day School in the Yukon are still limited but what is currently available demonstrates a shift from the colonial narrative dominated by church and nation-making rhetoric to a more balanced or Indigenous-centric one that centres the survivors lived experienced (i.e., Smith, 2017; Cooke, 2016; TRC, 2015; 2015a; Edelman,
2012; Milloy 2006/1999; Nadasdy, 2003; Coates, 1984). This can be seen in a discursive analysis of the academic cannon currently available. For example, language shifts from the view that these were the churches failed “experiment” of assimilation, plagued with “tenuous rumors” and “tales” of deplorable conditions and treatment that left students “betwixt and between” (Coates, 1984) to post TRC research that focuses on the lived experience of survivors that shifts the perspective to one of cultural genocide through forced assimilation that has lasting and intergenerational effects (Smith, M., 2017; Edelman, 2012). Even Coates and Morrison’s (2016) recent history of the Yukon is settler-centric in language and focus; however, the authors do acknowledge colonialism “was” a “complex and disruptive force’ (p.224). As argued above, there is nothing “was” about colonialism and the settler colonialism legacies continue to impact Indigenous peoples in what is now called the Yukon. These impacts are particularly felt in the north by many first-generation survivors as two recent graduate theses and the TRC (2015a) demonstrate through the analysis of survivors’ stories, healing journeys, and experiences of the settlement process. For many of these survivors, including participants in this case study, the current reconciliation process is perceived as a continuation of the Settler colonial hegemony they experienced in Residential School. Having to relive via retelling these traumas and abuses is perceived as voyeuristic. Others feel access to traditional sites is still limited and land ‘negotiated’ in the capitol is ‘negotiated piecemeal’. Relocation of the community for some is about full decolonization and full land return. This ‘negotiated piecemeal’, the land settlement agreements discussed in section 2.4.2, are seen as a continuation of settler colonialism as Settler voices, the lawyers, and politicians, are perceived to be at the centre and not Indigenous voices and in this case not Kwanlin Dün citizens.

Residential School as a settler colonial instrument in the Yukon was also a catalytic agent, a structure and a process that leads to the break down of families and communities as well as a loss of interconnectedness, loss of language and cultural beliefs, loss of spiritual connections, loss of identity, alienation, and addictions and health/mental health challenges, (Smith, 2017; TRC, 2015; Coulthard, 2014; Ladner, 2014; Regan, 2010; Stasiulis & Yuval-Davis, 1995). The Council of Yukon First Nations reports that “in 2001, 87% of First Nations adults living in the Yukon report that at least one family member had attended a federal residential school…25% of First nations adults attended…and among those 45-75, the proportion climbed to more than 50%...speaks to the depth of the impact within Yukon First Nations communities” (2011: 26). The impacts of Indian Residential School system, of acculturation, are experienced at a variety of different levels, and this spectrum has social,
cultural, and economic consequences impacting the capacity of some survivors, both directly and inter-generationally. Indian Residential School system affects on capacity are related to how it undermines Tagish Kwan culture, disrupts families for generations impacting the social and kin interconnectedness and transmission of culture, language, laws, and other skills. Despite these multiple impacts, first and second generations stories of the lived experience are also filled with agency that educate, heal, and show how Indigenous people “resisted, grew stronger, redefined who we are, and above all we are resilient” (Smith, M., 2017: 88). This shift in the literature is one towards decolonization, for it acknowledges the knowledge production of Indigenous peoples and systems, spaces, and places, as the focus shifts to the everyday, ongoing, relational lived experience of their agency, resistance, and resilience (de Leeuw & Hunt, 2018). Cooke argues these moments of agency, resistance, and resilience are powerful and are ways of “unsettling this Settler colonial cultural production by making visible the legacies and structures of displacement, dispossession, and violence that lay at the core of the project of Canadian nation-building” (2016: 235).

2.4 Present Day ~ A Case of Continued Settler Colonialism

Indigenous peoples are not, nor do they continue to be only victims, objects only of such assimilative policy. They are also agents and creators of their own history (Miller, 2004). The protectionism, assimilative and genocidal policies discussed above have failed to reach their implicit conclusion. The context of continued settler colonialism doesn’t give voice to the many narratives of resistance and refusal of the generation of Indigenous people “who worked around the Indian Act…since it was first established” (Sellars, 2016: 62). It assumes that social distress and change is analogous to social and cultural collapse. There is an inherent duality within this assumption, one of “social dysfunction, violence, and poverty” that continues to exist today that is paralleled alongside continual resistance and reclamation and revitalization of “languages, governance, and legal systems” (Regan, 2010:3). On the other sides shifts in legislation, the continual changes to the Indian Act 1876 that leads to the dismantling of the Indian Residential School system in the 1990s, and the influx of Indigenous people within previously urban Settler spaces (approximately 60% according to Statistics Canada) means more integration and interaction. Another example of the continuation of this settler colonial institutional legacy is seen in how the Department of Indigenous Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) is found to discriminate against Indigenous children on reserves by the Canadian Human Rights Tribunal (FNCFCSC et al., 2016; 2019) about equitable funding of child welfare services. Since the 2016 ruling, the Tribunal has issued nine non-compliance orders against the Government of Canada to stop racially
discriminating against Indigenous children (FNCFCSC et al., 2020). First Nations Child and Family Caring Society of Canada (FNCFCSC) Executive Director and child welfare advocate Dr. Cindy Blackstock shows that the earmarked budget of the Government of Canada in 2017 and in 2019 fails to cover even the shortfall in funding for Indigenous child welfare in the country (Fontaine, 2017). In 2020 the federal government filed for a judicial review. Blackstock commented during a press conference that noncompliance does nothing to ensure "this generation of First Nations children isn’t unnecessarily removed from their families because of Canada’s inequitable funding” (ibid). This is yet another example of systemic and systematic institutional racism inherent in the continued settler colonial logics that still exist within Canada.

2.4.1 Tšilhqot’in Case and the Nation today

The narrative of resistance runs through Tšilhqot’in history finding its roots in the k’andzin (late 1800s to present time) as the Chilcotin War of 1864 is still taught as an example of deliberative and assertive response to political and economic forces of change brought by the Settlers that have jeopardized the ongoing relationship with the land (Kunkel, 2017; Bhattacharyya et al., 2012). As a people, the Tšilhqot’in continue to identify strongly as caretakers of the land, and place or the land is interwoven and integrated with knowledge of self, family, and culture (Bhattacharyya et al., 2012: 219). The land continues to be the central focus also of continued settler colonialism and the divergent views of the relationship with the land (Indigenous) versus the relationship to the land (Settler) is seen in the construction of the narratives of the land. The power of particles with and to in expressing these complex relationships is telling and is an insight into the role the land has and continues to play in the interactions and lived experiences of social citizenship. Lowman and Barker (2015) argue Indigenous people’s stories of the land imbue it with a spirit and it is considered alive as part of “our relations”. For Settler peoples, stories of the land treat it as a thing, an object to be possessed, conquered, or settled. The relationship with or to the land is important for in this localized context it provides further insight for the next piece on the Tšilhqot’in case. “This is what we are protecting. This is why our War Leaders have fought and died for our peoples to protect these waters …as well as all our waters, our lands, our wild salmon, our wild plants, and our way of life. And that is why our Elders have testified and proven to Canada, to all people, that we were here” (Marilyn Baptiste in Williams, 2014).

As stated previously, in the early days of the colony of British Columbia, land was not ceded by Indigenous peoples and the vast majority of land is simply claimed by the Crown. There were very few treaties, and no legal agreements, the Crown simply annexed the land
(Lowman & Barker, 2016). This was also perceived to be a way to stop gold seekers from America ‘claiming’ the land, but it was also in direct violation of the Royal Proclamation of 1763. Resistance became a legal battle after the 1951 amendments to the Indian Act 1876 lifted the ban on legal representation and pursuits of land claims. The Canadian court system was, and continues to be, utilized to re-establish rights and title to the land as Indigenous peoples are armed with the knowledge that colonialism tried to but never extinguished these rights. As Sellars (2016) argues you cannot be granted something that is already yours.

The first case was brought in 1973 by the Nisga’a and it sets the stage for future land title cases. However, it was not until 1997 in the case of Delgamuukw v. British Columbia that the Supreme Court clearly states that Indigenous peoples without treaties had not ceded their lands and thus legally recognized that Indigenous rights and title existed within the province. Growing Settler populations along with land and resource developments constrains these spaces of unceded lands and create shrinking boundaries that have been reconfigured and relocated into the market economy of the province (Kunkel, 2017; Harris, 2002; Willems-Braun, 1997). The Tŝilhqot’in, despite the remoteness of many of their communities to Settler or urban spaces within the interior of British Columbia, are not immune. In 1983, Xèni Gwét’in, the remotest of the six communities, first blockaded their land and then filed a court case following a move by the province to grant a forestry licence under Forestry Act to log in their unceded territories.

After more than thirty years of legal battling, on June 26, 2014, the Supreme Court of Canada in an 8-0 decision upheld and recognized title under section 35(1) of the Constitution Act of 1982 of almost 1750 km² of the claim area where Tŝilhqot’in rights to hunt, trap, and trade were already confirmed in 2012 by the BC Court of Appeal. This is the first-time title is declared outside of already designated reserve land and it means Tŝilhqot’in have the right to control the land. They have the right to chose how to use and manage the land and to economic benefits of the land and its resources as long as it does not “deprive future generations of the land” (Tŝilhqot’in Nation v. British Columbia, 2014). It is perceived by some media and legal critics as a landmark case that will potentially alter the political and juridical terrains (i.e., McCue, 2014; Borrows, 2015). However, some scholars caution that this case is in fact the opposite of an assertion of rights and sovereignty as the ruling can be considered a continuation of the settler-colonial logics of elimination, including those of alternative Indigenous legal orders (i.e., Ladner, 2016; Christie, 2015). Whether the decision will alter things or will lead only to continued settler-colonial land policies is yet to be seen. To date, the Province of British Columbia, and the Tŝilhqot’in Nation (2016) signed the
Nenqay Deni Accord, also known as the people’s accord, a reconciliation framework agreement in principle. On March 26th, 2018, in a historic and unprecedented event, the six current Chiefs of the Tșilhqot’in Nation were welcomed onto the floor of the House of Commons while in session. All 338 MPs and the Speaker of the House unanimously passed a motion brought by the Tșilhqot’in Nation itself. This motion opened the floor of the House to the Tșilhqot’in Chiefs and acknowledged the protocols of the Tșilhqot’in Nation in the form of a drum song performed by a Tșilhqot’in youth ambassador as a formal response to the Government of Canada’s exoneration of the Tșilhqot’in War Chiefs (Tșilhqot’in National Government, 2018).

The following year the Tșilhqot’in National Government also signed a framework agreement in principle with both the Federal Government of Canada and the Government of British Columbia; this document is known as Gwets’en Nilt’i Pathway Agreement, a successor to the Nenqay Deni Accord (TNG, 2019). Beyond the scope of this research the implementation success, or not, will take time to determine and actions, or inactions, will ‘speak louder than words’ as one Tșilhqot’in Elder stated at the historic signing event.

Although outside of the bounded scope of this case study, I feel it is important to include a brief discussion of the Tșilhqot’in vs. British Columbia (2014) case and the perceptions of it because it became a part of the dialogue with almost all of the participants as my field work and data collection occurred after. It is now the lens through which some of the participants see themselves as citizens, as well as how they see interactions and relationships with others. It is a possible shift in relations, a historical contingency, which is perhaps in progress with this Supreme Court decision. Perhaps a further shift occurs in 2016, when the then-Premier of British Columbia Christy Clark issues a formal apology from the province for the hanging of the six chiefs. Then another in 2018 with the Federal apology and exoneration mentioned above, Prime Minister Trudeau in the House of Commons March 26, 2018, acknowledges the injustice, betrayal of trust, that these events are not ‘confined to history’ but passed down and,

as an important symbol of our commitment to reconciliation, we confirm without reservation that Chief Lhats’asʔin, Chief Biyil, Chief Tilaghed, Chief Taqed, Chief Chayses, and Chief Ahan are fully exonerated of any crime or wrongdoing. In the words of Chief Lhats’asʔin, they meant war, not murder. We recognize that these six chiefs were leaders of a nation, that they acted in
accordance with their laws and traditions, and that they are well-regarded as heroes by their people (Tsilhqot’in Nation, 2018a).

These events demonstrate how sociohistorical conditions like the Chilcotin War continue to influence and impact current interactions between the Settler governments and Tsilhqot’in Nation and can be viewed as an example of Tsilhqot’in agency. This phrasing, ‘they meant war, not murder’, is significant as it’s a shift from colonial narrative of a massacre, of brutal tactics, and sneak attacks while the road crew is sleeping. These Tsilhqot’in War Chiefs actions were judged by European law to be murder. However, through the Tsilhqot’in lens it is a narrative of threatening biological warfare (smallpox), no permission to be in territory, no reciprocity, and the abhorrent treatment of women as seen in the accusation of rape, all of these are instances of breaking the law. The Tsilhqot’in are known as fearless and brutal warriors and known for this type of warfare tactics and their actions, the war, was justified under the Dechen Ts’edilhtan.

Finally, the parallel processes of cultural awakening and resurgence are seen in the formation of the Tsilhqot’in Women’s Council in 2019 and the governance work being done across the nation where traditional laws are being recorded, written down, modernized, and ratified into laws like Tsilhqot’in Nation’s Dechen Ts’edilhtan Emergency Moose Protection (2018), Tsilhqot’in Nation’s Nulh Ghah Dechen Ts’edilhtan – “Tsilhqot’in Nation Wildlife Law” (2019), and the Tsilhqot’in Nation’s ?Elhdaqox Dechen Ts’edilhtan – “Êsdilângh Sturgeon River Law” (2020). Localized language revitalization and on the land learning are happening through negotiated secured funding, as well as skills training in residential carpentry to rebuild the abilities and capacities for the nation to address the ongoing impacts of continued settler colonialism and intergenerational trauma. Tsilhqot’in Nation is acknowledged as “making significant strides to address issues of poverty, violence, mental health and addictions in the face of ongoing challenges” (Turpel-Lafond, 2014: ii) of continued settler colonialism.

As the sociohistoric context highlights, Tsilhqot’in mobilized to oppose land appropriation for resource development when such actions do not adhere to the protocols and laws of the nation from the Chilcotin War to forestry and mining initiatives for almost thirty years (see the Tsilhqot’in v. British Columbia 2014; 2007 and Wellburn, 2012 for more details). The Tsilhqot’in Case appears to lead to an increased sense of political agency and engagement that can be argued to have been sustained over time in the context of the historical and current persistent patterns of inequality and epistemic violence and injustices. Bhattachryya et al. argue that the “overall effect is that community members have internal,
collective strength, and confidence that stems from the knowledge that they and their ancestors have protected the land” (2012:222). The Tšilhqot’in offers place-based opportunities to also explore title as a contested process, the perception of still being at war, and the exploration of the power of the particle with in the space between on civil society and civil society organizations.

2.4.2 Formation of Kwanlin Dün: Land Settlement Agreements & Self-Government

Settler colonial and Indigenous systems of knowledge production, spaces, and systems shapes the context within which the narratives of the intertwined relationships of Indigenous and Settler are woven into the fabric that creates the Yukon Territory. Cooke (2016) argues that ideas of the “North” that pervade the narratives of nation-building in Canada provides the foundation of settler colonialism. This, she argues is revealed in three specialized narratives in the Yukon: the Klondike Gold Rush, the Alaskan highway, and ‘the pristine wildernesses’. These operate through the structures and processes of settler colonialism to not only locate the national narrative locally but also to obscure Indigenous endurance of violent displacements and disposessions (ibid), and knowledge production steeped in resurgence, resistance, and Indigenous refusal (Simpson, 2014; 2007). The ‘lore and lure’ of the narrative of the Alaskan Highway usually speaks to the upheaval of the territory’s social and economic structures because of WWII and rapid influx of thousands of people (Coates & Morrison, 2005). However, settler colonial knowledge production and corresponding nation-building narratives are being challenged, countered, and deconstructed. This enables us to see these narratives as also examples of not only the discursive but also the material displacement, erasure, and dispossession of Indigenous people as most of the highways were built on their trails and over their homes. Similar to British Columbia, opening this travel corridor further increased the influx of Settlers into some Indigenous spaces for the first time and disrupted traditional harvesting and hunting practices on the land due to environmental damages and wildlife decline, as well as gender-based violence (Council of Yukon First Nations, 2011a; Horne, 2010). These often ignored social, economic, and political realities disrupted existing Indigenous economies with boom-and-bust cycles, gendered imbalance and increased violence, bureaucratization, health epidemics, and increased mortality rates (Coates & Morrison, 2005).

Regan’s (2010) rich counter-narrative calls to attention of what exists in the Yukon and speaks to the failure of protectionism, assimilative, and genocidal policies highlighted above to reach their implicit conclusion. The ongoing agency and continued knowledge production of Indigenous peoples in this territory speaks to this rich counter-narrative of
resistance and refusal in the face of acculturation. Most Indigenous peoples outside of the three urban Settler enclaves continued their way of life undisturbed for much longer (Smith, M., 2017 & TRC, 2015). Examples of acculturation are seen in the shifts from using Indigenous languages to English and the breakdown of some kin-based relationships. As with the first case, assumptions in the Yukon context that equate social distress and changes with social and cultural collapse do not acknowledge the counter-narratives of resistance, reclamation, and revitalization. These counter narratives are unsettling the settler colonial spatialized narratives of the national story of Canada, as seen in the ‘North’ narrative discussed above to what Lowman and Barker have called a move towards Settlers “understanding our history and present-day actions as participating in a protracted project of dispossession, elimination, and one of the largest land grabs in the history of humankind” (2016: 47).

As with British Columbia, there is no treaty signed with any Indigenous peoples and the territory that is to become the Yukon is annexed by the Crown mostly as a way to ensure that America did not gain anymore land after purchasing Alaska from the Russians (Smith, M., 2017; TRC, 2015; Coates & Morrison, 2005). The project of dispossession, elimination, and land annexing through the continued settler colonialism is recognized by Indigenous leaders. The first written record of the Tanglish Kwan is of the recognition and the need to protect their land and traditional hunting and harvesting practices in 1900. Chief Jim Boss (Kishoot) petitioned the Territory’s Commissioner and again in 1902 when he petitioned the Federal Government (Council of Yukon First Nations, 2011). Heedless of this protest, Indigenous people along the Yukon River continued to be displaced and marginalized to make room for the growing Settler population. The reserve within Whitehorse, for example, was moved from the river and city centre four times between 1915-1921. This shifting of the status of reserve lands, whether by location or existence, is an example of this project of dispossession, elimination, and land annexing. In 1948, Ottawa removed reserve status and created a spatialized settler colonial narrative that disconnects Indigenous people from their traditional territory in what is now Whitehorse. By 1956, without consultation, the Federal Government unilaterally decided to amalgamate Indigenous peoples within the area of the new capital and created the Whitehorse Indian Band, known today as Kwanlin Dün First Nations (ibid). In 1972-73, a delegation of Kwanlin Dün Elders formed an organization called the Yukon Native Brotherhood (now the Council of Yukon First Nations), led by Elijah Smith (INAC, 2010). They traveled to Ottawa to present a proposal called Together Today for our Children Tomorrow. The core message of this proposal marked the beginning
the land claims process, stating “without land, Indian people have no soul, no life, no identity, no purpose” (The Council for Yukon Indians, 1977: 31). The document was the first formal attempt by Indigenous peoples in what is now the Yukon to unsettle the colonial and continued settler colonial narratives. It did so by laying out a counter-narrative that takes an Indigenous-centric view of the relationship to the land, outlines the impact the colonialism and continued settler colonialism in the Yukon, and offers principles for negotiating a land claim by re-establishing rights and title to the land that had never been ceded or extinguished. It reflected a process of knowledge production that argues for more Yukon Indigenous control and jurisdiction over their land and lives. This document set the scene for and continues to influence the Yukon land claims settlement process to this day.

The Yukon Council of Indians signed the Umbrella Final Agreement in May 1993 outlining the negotiated framework for fourteen First Nations of the Yukon to conclude their individual final land claims settlement agreements (Council of Yukon First Nations, 2011, 2011a; Coates & Morrison, 2005). According to former Yukon Premier and MLA Tony Penikett (1993) this process of Yukon self-government is a modern-day treaty appended to the Canadian constitution that gives Yukon Indigenous peoples three powers: self governance (replacing the Indian Act 1876), jurisdiction over designated lands, and jurisdiction over and devolution of social services. Penikett further argues that these Northern development agreements are Canada’s first “third order” self-government settlements that are both a demonstration of “confidence, optimism, and resilience” while also having a “depressing and demoralizing effect” due to “the length of time taken to negotiate” (2017:71-72). Either way, they lead to the devolution of authority and establishment of Indigenous communities with similar powers of provinces or territories. Coates and Morrison (2005) assert that land claims settlement have not only provided investment capital but shift the power as Indigenous “peoples, communities, and organizations [are] pivotal players in the territorial political order” (2005: 311). MLA and Indigenous leader Marian Horne’s perspective provides a counter narrative; she describes the legacies of colonialism and the continued settler colonialism prior to land settlement process as “divesting us of rights and responsibilities, Canada took away our ability to be full citizens [and it] …had devastating consequences for our culture” (2010:2). For her, land settlement agreements and the pursuit of self-government is the recognition, reestablishment, and revival of Indigenous governance systems that existed long before the arrival of colonialist or Settlers.

Alcantara’s (2013) in depth deductive exploration of how the institutional context of the land claims settlement process’ affected actors’ relative power, preferences, and
incentives demonstrates how it drove the strategies utilized and adoption/adaptation of settlement goals. These contested tools of public policy highlight the strategies that produce settlements within the context of power relations influenced by an institutional framework (unequal political resources and parameters determined by federal government). Yukon political parties correlate constitutional development with the process, as “all four negotiating parties realized that land claims negotiations were very much tied to the political evolution of the territory” (ibid: 83). Alcantara explains the divergent outcomes of the successfully signed land claims settlements came down to a “compatibility of goals, choice of tactics, Aboriginal group cohesion as it relates to treaty negotiations, and government perceptions of the Aboriginal group” (2013:97). Indigenous peoples of the Yukon had to be willing to “accept a final agreement that operates within the political, economic, social, and legal contexts of the Canada federation” (ibid: 97-98). This speaks to the counter argument Nadasdy provides that this political process of knowledge integration has had a counter effect and that land settlement agreements in the North have in reality continued settler colonial logics of elimination that replace Indigenous knowledge’s, “ways of talking, thinking, and acting” (2013: 19). They are seen as ‘piecemeal negotiations’ for what has never been ceded in a process that centres Settler voices, i.e., politicians and lawyers. Alcantara’s (2013) research also highlights how the Federal government’s focus, gatekeepers, and shifts in Indigenous leadership could stall the process or propel it forward. In addition to this the factor of internal cohesion’s impact on the land, the settlement agreement process is also affected by historical interactions with settler colonial processes and practices. Whitehorse has always been a space and place of gathering of many different peoples as the traditional inhabitants welcomed all. For bureaucratic purposes the Federal government externally amalgamated all Indigenous peoples in Whitehorse into one ‘community’. During the land settlement negotiations Kwanlin Dün and Ta’an Kwäch’an peoples separated. This shifted the process dramatically for the Kwanlin Dün and the other Indigenous people in the capital, the “come from aways” (pp. 107-108). The author further argues that other factors of internal cohesion, social problems (i.e., substance abuse and unemployment), and political infighting/lateral violence (p.109) also impacted the land settlement negotiation process. These aspects, along with perceptions of success of the process and capacity for implementation, are further influenced by acculturation and perception of integration into Settler society, as well as trust, and the role of leadership as tool of agency (pp.115-116).
Alcantara’s research demonstrates that leadership as a tool of agency is in alignment with theoretical structure-agency arguments in a space and place that is often ignored in the literature. Kwanlin Dün provides one of the few site-specific socio historical contextual analysis spaces for these contested tools of public policy. It is within this socio historic context that the participants of this research spoke of how this contested tool and associated processes forge narratives and counter narratives of the success of processes and the implementation so far. The Umbrella Agreement and the journey of (re)forming Kwanlin Dün through the first land settlement agreement to be successfully negotiated within a city’s limits in Canada is significant because since the first contact with Settler society in 1842, Whitehorse has been affected by settler colonial logics. This includes the formation of a reservation that was “relocated serval times, sat for many years next to the industrial area” until it’s moved to current location as a result of the land settlement agreement despite the desire to return to old reserve expressed by some (Coates & Morrison, 2005: 291-292). The final relocation by the Department of Indian Affairs in 1921, “creating Lot 226, ‘the Old Village” and aforementioned Whitehorse Indian Band amalgamation in 1956 would argues Alcantara later complicate Kwanlin Dün’s land claims settlement (2013: 77). In 1985, the community purchased the McIntyre subdivision (current location) as part of the negotiating process and in 2005 Kwanlin Dün signed its agreement (ibid: 78).

Implementing self-government, according to Dacks, attests to the diversity of agreements signed and the possibility “under these agreements to create governments that embody traditional political practices” (2004: 677). It is also argued to demonstrate retention and praxis of Indigenous values – i.e., principle of leadership accountability through citizenship levels of participation in governance processes (Smith, M. 2017; Alcantara, 2013; Dacks, 2004). There are challenges to fully utilizing new financial and land/resources management systems, and most pressing is human capacity, as the colonial legacy has interrupted skills and expertise development, and this is further compounded by current low literacy and essential skill levels.

2.5 Literacy: A Sketch of the CSOs Landscape

According to UNESCO, “literacy is the ability to identify, understand, interpret, create, communicate, compute, and use print and written materials associated with varying contexts...[and] involves a continuum of learning to enable an individual to achieve his or her goals, to develop his or her knowledge and potential, and to participate fully in the wider society.” In British Columbia, approximately 40-60 percent of adults in isolated communities do not have the minimum literacy levels required to deal with everyday challenges (Decoda,
Literacy is a spectrum of ability that encompasses the basic skills people need to achieve their goals, to function and thrive in the modern economy, and to develop their knowledge and potential. It is the cornerstone of human capital development, the foundational competence upon which the acquisition of other skills depends. Scholars argue that this level of literacy attainment leaves Canadian society without the necessary tools to handle the ensuing skills shortages as the baby boomer generation retire, and the increased needs of the growing Indigenous population (Anaya, 2014; Helin 2008; MacDonald & Wilson, 2016, 2013; Saul, 2008;). It includes also being culturally responsive and determining what “literacy” means for Indigenous communities beyond the normative definition cited above, in particular around language and cultural knowledge rebuilding required as a result of the legacy of the assimilative policies like the Indian Act and its legacy of Indian Residential Schools. It is a process of systematically looking into how the continuation of this legacy and apparent institutionally systematic view of Indigenous students being seen “as less than human” (Lowman & Barker, 2015: 13) continues to be the foundation of policy and policy-praxis. However, Indigenous scholar Taiaiake Alfred (2009) argues clearly that government policies and praxis are rooted in a Eurocentric value system and are fundamental to the colonization of Indigenous peoples both historically and currently. These policies and policy processes have systematically sought to replace Indigenous worldviews and systems with those of Settler society (Clark, 2012; Lowman & Barker, 2015) often through social service systems like education and health.

Literacy thus can be seen as the thread that weaves together all of the other social determinants of health of citizens. National research demonstrates that more than half of Indigenous adults do not have the basic level of literacy and essential skills to cope with demands of everyday life (HRSDC, 2003) and this includes participating in meaningful employment. As a result, sixty percent of Indigenous children live below the poverty line - more than four times the national average (MacDonald & Wilson, 2016). If it does nothing, Canada will face the economic and demographic tsunami described by Helin (2011; 2008), and what Saul (2008) called the worst threat to the Canadian experiment to date. Literacy in its widest scope is a critical component to overcoming the existing structural and systematic racism within Canadian society (Helin, 2011; 2008; Ladner 2008; Murphy, 2005; Saul, 2008), not only on the macro level but also on the micro level. International research has shown that investment in adult education and lifelong learning not only helps a country’s economy or labour market objectives but helps to foster a strong sense of social cohesion, community engagement, and active citizenship (OECD, 2013). Both CSOs under exploration,
Rotary International and Yukon Child Development Centre focus on literacy equity as one of their pillars or focuses of service; the following provides a brief socio-historic context for each and situates each in this literacy landscape.

2.5.1 Rotary International and Write to Read BC

Rotary International (RI), the world’s first service organization, was founded in Chicago, Illinois in 1905 by lawyer Paul Harris and two other businessmen (Charles, 1987). Founder Paul Harris (1948) in his own words stress that he started Rotary for “friendship was the foundation”, creating a social organization that fostered a sense of belonging. Since then, it has grown to include 1.2 million members in more than 35,000 clubs across 200 countries of “neighbors, friends, leaders, and problem-solvers who see a world where people unite and take action to create lasting change – across the globe, in our communities, and in ourselves”. This organizational vision is support by RI’s mission, both are found on their website; RI’s mission is to “provide service to others, promote integrity, and advance world understanding, goodwill, and peace”. Rotary volunteers, Rotarians, come from a range of professional backgrounds and undertake projects with local and international communities that focus on peace and conflict resolution, disease prevention and treatment, water and sanitation, maternal and child health, basic education and literacy, and economic and community development. (Rotary International, 2016). In 2020 the organization added a seventh areas of focus sustainability and the environment. Basic education and literacy (BEL) are one of Rotary International avenue of service and Write to Read BC is a joint literacy equity project that brings together Rotarians, and skilled professionals, and community champions and their rural and remote Indigenous communities.

The Rotary Foundation (THF) was established in 1917 (Rotary International, 1987), and according to the organization’s website in the past 100 years has spent $3 billion on sustainable projects. Charity Navigator, an independent nonprofit evaluator, has given TRF its top ranking for the last 13 years using two metrics: financial and accountability and transparency (Charity Navigator 2021). Currently, RI’s top priority is the Polio Eradication campaign through the PolioPlus program. Since 1985, RI and partnering organizations in the Global Polio Eradication Initiative have reduced polio cases by 99 percent worldwide and in 2020 Africa was declared free of wild polio. (Sever, McGovern, Scott, Pandak, Edwards & Goodstone, 2017; Scherbel-Ball, 2020). As a result, the Association of Fundraising Professionals recognized the Rotary Foundation and named it the ‘world’s outstanding foundation for 2016’ citing its comprehensive campaign to eradicate polio (Segedin, 2016).
Research undertaken in partnership with Rotary by John Hopkins University’s Centre for Civil Society Studies (Salamon, Haddock & Sokolowski, 2019) reveals that the annual impact of Rotary International’s volunteers 47 million hours of service is the equivalent of “nearly 27,000 full-time equivalent workers” and the estimated value is “US$850 million a year” in savings to communities in service costs. According to Newhouse (2019) in a news release about the research,

the value of gifts of time outdistances the value of monetary gifts internationally by a factor of two to one…it would be unwise to conclude from this that either of these philanthropic resources can substitute for governmental involvement in social, economic, an environmental problem-solving, it seems equally unwise to ignore the substantial contribution that such philanthropic resources can make, as we have tended to do.

Write to Read BC solves the problem of space, of lack of infrastructure for learning, for education, for literacy by providing a modular trailer or renovating other community spaces to house a library learning centre and collecting donated and new books, furniture, and computers. It is a Government House of British Columbia legacy project that addresses the issue of literacy in isolated Indigenous communities throughout British Columbia, focusing on rural and remote areas. In order to address literacy equity in the province, the CSO Rotary International was enlisted by th28th Lieutenant Governor Steven L. Point (Sto:lo) and Rotary International District 5040 Governor Robert (Bob) Blacker (Settler), cofounders of the project and both interviewed as part of this case study. They enlisted Rotarians to help first bring books and then the project became about co-creating spaces for libraries learning centres and literacy resources with isolated Indigenous communities that had either been identified or self-identified as requiring assistance in building literacy equity. Focusing on underserved remote and rural indigenous communities, Write to Read BC’s intention is to bring citizens, Indigenous and Settler (i.e., Rotarians or other skilled professionals), together to determine what the literacy equity project will be. Projects focus on building literacy infrastructure via a library learning centre and literacy resources or health literacy via a dental mission. Through community-based meetings Write to Read BC, which includes volunteers who are: Rotarians, skilled professionals, and community identified community champion(s), together meet with community members at large including leadership, youth, Elders, and Knowledge Keepers. Write to Read BC team works with the community to jointly determine how the resources that have been solicited through donation to the project through established partners and stakeholders, from the community itself, and the human capital of Rotarians and
other stakeholders are used to build the vision of the community for a space and a place for literacy or health literacy equity. The process is localized and done with the community’s champions guidance and based on the community engagement session or sessions.

2.5.2 Yukon Child Development Centre and the Dusk’a Headstart Learning Centre

YCDC is founded in 1979 based on a recommendation stemming from the 1977 study of children needs within the territory conducted by the Yukon Association for Children with Learning Disabilities (YCDCA, 2014). The Centre started with two staff in a portable building behind a local elementary school. Since its inception the organization’s primary focus continues to be serving families of the Yukon with children with special needs. As the population has grown and with the shifts in demographics and political power and thus service delivery to the new capital Whitehorse fostering the growth of the YCDC. By 1991, the centre is relocated to a refurbished facility adjacent to the local Ministry of Education. This relocation is accompanied by a new Board governance model, peer model preschool, and an increase in consistent services such as speech-language, physiotherapy, occupational and developmental therapy as well as services to outlining areas. This includes Kwanlin Dün who has been a partner for more than 25 years. Along with these services, YCDC provides an integrated therapeutic preschool and a variety of family centred and family lead early intervention programs and services for children zero to six. The Centre’s mission is “We work with families and community members to provide therapeutic services and support the developmental needs of all Yukon children from birth to kindergarten”. Securing base funding in 1999 from the territorial government allows the centre to resolve its funding crisis and begin to address wait times for services both at its centre and through its outreach program. In 2014 an increase to this base funding is secured.

In 2019, the YCDC celebrated 40 years of service and the next year receives their second three-year (the longest allocated) accreditation. The YCDC is now an organization accredited by the Commission on the Accreditation of Rehabilitation Facilities (CARF) International. CARF International is an independent, nonprofit accredditor of health and human services facilities and have been externally determining organizations standards of service delivery in Canada since 1969. Accreditation is seen as way for the organization to ensure the ongoing process of continually improving services.

In 1995 the YCDC opened a satellite office in Kwanlin Dün; a relationship and partnership that has lasted more than twenty-five years. As a result of the 2005 Land Settlement Agreement, the community is able to amalgamate its childcare services to create the Dusk’a Headstart Learning Centre to provide and promote “culturally based
programming…and…a healthy sense of community” (KCFN – parental handbook, 2014). Dusk’a also incorporates a YCDC permanent office, one full time staff member, and space for the outreach team to provide in community childcare services.

The socio-historical conditions as laid out in this chapter, at the macro, meso, and micro levels, demonstrate the current continuation of settler colonial logics. These legislated realities lead to social forces that provide the historical conditions that form what Lowman and Barker called fluid non-discrete extremely heterogenous and diverse group identity categories in Canada of ‘Indigenous people’ and ‘Settler people’ (2015:17). This non-discrete positioning allows for the acknowledgement of continual interaction and mutual impacts. It is within the above laid out socio-historical and political context that the sites of investigation and the participants narratives of their lived experience of social citizenship processes and practices are nested. It allows for to exploration of the problematized context of continued settler colonialism and the perceptions of concurrent abjection and agency. A comparative analysis of these socio-historic contexts will be presented in chapter seven. The meso level, provincial and territorial, will matter in how this re-problematized context is experienced by each nation and the participants in these cases. The cases are similar but different in how each respond in accordance with social processes and practices, war or negotiations. Their ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing formed over millennia before contact will determine the levels or not of trust in and effects of these interactions. The socio-historic context of each case presented here builds on the argument of why situating the research in Canada and the Pacific Northwest by considering each specific case as a place, a space, to explore the counter narratives of each that centres the voices of Indigenous peoples and communities. Therefore, to do so the next chapter will be a review of the theoretical literature on citizenship, abjection and marginalization, and civil society.
Chapter Three: Literature Review – Walking with those who came before

As stated in chapter one, my doctoral thesis applies theories of citizenship, abjection or marginalization, and civil society to explore the role of civil society organizations in the lived experience of social citizenship processes and practices of both Settler and Indigenous individuals, groups, and communities within the Pacific Northwest of Canada. Literature on citizenship contains multiple often contradictory meta theories of citizenship. Despite this, citizenship is still an integral part of political discourse about individual, groups, and community attachment. It is a contested concept, but one that has the potential to include or exclude, to define who is a citizen, who are the people, but also to define the other, abject, (non) citizen. Canovan (2005) argues that ‘the people’, the citizens, of a nation are the outcome of political mobilization; a political collectivity of a nation’s myth building that can either legitimize or justify political conditions or actions. Eurocentric, or Western, history is embedded with classical and colonial notions of citizenship that continue to be the foundation of many theories today. It is within the imperial colonial context that the Canadian federation came into being, and as Laforest (1998) argues, even though Canada left the British Empire in 1982, “the spirit of imperialism is present in [its] functioning” (p.60) as seen in the federation’s interactions with the ‘other’, i.e., Quebec and Indigenous peoples.

A useful start is Kymlicka and Norman’s (1994) survey of citizenship theory. They put forth two emergent themes: the traditional perspective of citizenship as a set of rights and/or citizenship as enacted in the interconnected social relationships and association, i.e., the process of citizenization. Citizenship can be both an institution (rights) or structure and a process of social construction produced and reproduced overtime; both can either include or abjectify. So, citizenship can be an institution, perceived as it is a legal set of rights that allow citizens to do certain things within a society or nation based on a set of norms or assumptions (i.e., a standard operating procedure). Citizenship can also be as a process of social construction produced and reproduced over time, based in collective subjectivity that enables citizens to navigate what these constructions mean. Institutionalist and social constructionist concepts are often quite similar. Both emphasis formal and informal norms, practices, and processes of lived experiences of citizenship. In this chapter I will demonstrate this argument and show how citizenship can be both and has the potential to marginalize or to be inclusive. The chapter will then situate these perspectives of citizenship and abjection within the problematized context of continued settler colonialism within the Pacific Northwest of Canada. The chapter ends with a discussion of civil society and civil society organizations (CSOs) that builds towards an argument that the civil society and CSOs are a
space between and a place to explore the spectrum of lived experiences of social citizenship processes and practices.

3.1 Classic and Colonial View of Citizenship

T. H. Marshall (1965; 1950) one of the most influential theorists with respect to citizenship as rights, proposes that citizenship has three elements – civil, political, and social – each composed of various rights rooted in welfare and distributive justice. It must also be recognized that these rights are envisioned for a specific type or class of citizen, a white male working within the public sphere. Marshall’s (1950) notion of rights is also based on the practices or actions of citizens, and he describes them using three elements of civil, political, and social to determine how rights are recognized and the degree of enactment in practice. I see it as the constant tug-of-war between notions of citizenship, capitalism, and prevailing social classes that allow for the continuation of inequalities inherent in the political. Marshall points out how the inequalities inherent within a capitalist society are the root of the shift from civil rights (individual rights) to political (collective rights). Marshall argues that social rights are the balance of the two and combined with economic security, welfare, social heritage, and participation can allow full access to standards of society for some (1963:74). In the 1800s these rights however were the purview of a small segment of society, privileged white males.

Mann’s (2012) synthesis of social citizenship development asserts there are four main components to Marshall’s notion of social citizenship. It requires: low levels of market inequality, a progressive redistributive wealth taxation system, welfare, and universal education and health. The reality of course is more complex, including in Canada. Marshall (1965; 1963; 1950) however provides no method for overcoming social inequalities that made their attainment difficult. He argues for a ‘fair balance’ between national and individual elements in social rights but claims the national level needs to be predominate in any liberal democratic welfare state. This is despite the claim within his citizenship typology that social rights define the ‘standard of civilization’ from a solely class-based perspective that ignores as Mann highlights “regional, ethnic, gender, and other forms of stratification” (2012:281). Thus, the tension is felt between a nation state’s claims of inclusiveness and the lived reality of exclusiveness and resulting abjection of “(non)citizens”. Yet, Marshall describes the aim as only the elimination of the illegitimate aspects that impact both the notion of citizenship and the economic system, not equality (1950:77). Marshall’s conceptualization of citizenship articulates there are ‘limits’ within the market and the standards of ‘legitimacy’ vary between the social and economic. Social justice and economic necessity are to be mediated by historic
class distinctions. This point generates the most criticism from scholars since the state and elite individuals (i.e., white males working within the public sphere) could exercise their power to withhold these rights and further marginalize or abjectify individual citizens demonstrating how citizenship intersects with race, class, and gender (Isin & Rygiel, 2007; Isin, Brodie, Juteau, & Stasiulis, 2008; Lister, 2003; Kristeva, 1982; Kymlicka, 2012; 1995; Tyler, 2013; 2009). Hall and Taylor (1996) further argue that it is precisely within these interactions, the organization so to speak of citizens, that the “interactive and creative dimensions of the process whereby institutions are socially constructed is most apparent” (p.950). Similarly, citizenship theorists began to move beyond the normative rights-based typologies of citizenship toward a perspective that is an active dynamic process of interactions and social constructions (i.e., Dean, 2014; Kymlicka, 2012; Lister, 2003, Young, 2000).

As a result of this shift toward process-based citizenship, scholars criticize and/or seek to refine Marshall’s theory of citizenship as a normative institution based solely on rights of an elite class of individuals. Critical analysis of the theory of citizenship and civil, political, and social rights became the norm following World War II nationally and globally. Kymlicka and Norman’s (1994) survey on citizenship theory highlights two challenges to this pursuit: (1) political challenges involve citizens’ relations (either to each other or the state) and (2) the inherent tendency to view citizenship as an ‘either or’ phenomenon – either as formal or as a desirable action. As a result, post-Marshallian scholarship tends to focus not only on the formal aspects of citizenship (i.e., right and social justice) but also on notions of responsibility and virtue in politic ethics and systems of social justice, moving from passive (Kymlicka & Norman, 1994) toward an active process of citizenship (i.e., Isin and Nielson, 2008; Kymlicka 2012; Lister, 2003). For example, Plant (1990) argues there are no social rights as they cannot be separated from political or civil rights. Lister (2003) alternatively asserts that social rights are “legitimate expressions of citizenship” (p.17) and a way of incorporating both the actions or contestations of citizens, in particular women, in both the public and private spheres of society.

Citizenship can also be a process that provides the conceptual position for a political need (Dean, 2014; Fraser, 1997; Soper, 1981). Contrary to Marshallian theory, this perspective claims that citizenship is inherently social proceeding civil and political aspects (Dean, 2014; Isin et al., 2008). Dean (2014) expands on this heuristic view by outlining a needs-rights taxonomy based on the notion that ‘human rights are defined and refined across time and space through lived experiences...[and] negotiations of social rights occur within
particular social context and relations of power” (p.130-131). Thus, “any social being can embrace layered combinations of subnational, transnational citizenship or citizenships based on indigenous or diasporic, ethnic, or religious, identities” (p.132). I see citizenship as a process and a practice, as a place based lived experience that is also a social construction or re-construction that honours the interdependency and interconnectedness of human axiologies, methodologies, ontologies, and epistemologies. In the next section I will explore arguments of how the institution or social construction of citizenship can be an inclusive or exclusive lived experience.

3.2 Who is a citizen – inclusion and exclusion – the process of the ‘other’

Building on the dual approach of the last section, citizenship can be conceived as a set of inclusionary or exclusionary norms and an ongoing process of interactions. These norms are continuously reconstructed as a structure, as a process, and/or as a practice. This section interweaves into the later notion Lister’s (2003) concepts of “critical synthesis” and “differential universalism” to build an argument that the concepts of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency need to be more explicit within the proposed processes and practices of citizenship to create a more inclusive conceptualization (one that questions by whom and for whom). Lister (2003) envisions this inclusive concept of citizenship utilizing a critical feminist theoretical framework to create a ‘critical syntheses’ of citizenship as both a “status, carrying a set of rights” and a “practice involving political participation” (pp.195-197). For her, human agency is the bridge in redefining the theory of citizenship as an inclusive ‘multi-layered’ way of knowing and doing in accordance with her idea of ‘differentiated universalism’ (universal rights that encompass the differences of gender). Her theory of citizenship as a differentiated process pushes the debate beyond the traditional notions of either/or and through a process of critical synthesis reconstructs citizenship “along pluralist and gender inclusive lines” (ibid: 197).

In the period between the Great War and end of WWII, Arendt (1966) points out many marginalized groups and populations had lost the inalienable ‘Rights of Man’. She conceptualizes a poignant paradox between the ideal ‘inalienable’ human rights that are only the purview of the privileged few and the stark reality of the ‘rightless’ multitudes (p.279). However, Arendt’s ‘right to have rights’ argument must be contextualized and, as Emejulu (2019) argues, put alongside her political anti-Black racism. For as “alongside Arendt’s important work on citizenship is her steadfast opposition to the American Civil Rights Movement and especially the struggle for desegregation” (p.205). Acknowledging these juxtapositions and uncontextualized taken-for-granted ideas is part of the difficult ongoing
work of un/decolonizing key concepts like citizenship and power and how citizenship processes and practices can both simultaneously privilege and abject. Privilege here refers to agency of choice regarding the social, cultural, economic, and political resources available and abject is the limited, impeded or lack of said agency of choice. Young (2000) argues the institution, the structure of social groups can privilege or marginalize citizens associational activities privately, civically, and publicly via the state, the economy, and civil society. She advocates for a process of inclusive decision making, a critical reimagining of social relations and processes towards a pluralistic, communicative, and engaged transformation of justly shared problem solving to strengthen democracy and reduce social injustice. This theme of ‘privilege’ and social exclusion is critically expanded in the scholarship of citizenship as the theory of social abjection is concerned with notions of power, subjugation, and resistance (Wiebe, 2014; Tyler, 2013 & 2009; Kristeva, 1982; McClintock, 1995; Khanna, 2009).

Lister’s (2003) citizenship theory highlights the dynamics and interwoven nature of political power to either abjectify or empower citizens. Her concept of ‘critical synthesis’ bridges these approaches of institutionalism and social constructionism. Lister’s concept highlights the interwoven and dynamic nature of political power to either abject or include citizens in this process. It weaves this concept of fluid human agency and demands that it be re-imagined going beyond gender and class to incorporate race and ethnicity. Isin and Nielson’s (2008) conceptualization of “citizenship acts” shows how interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in these intersections of race, class, and gender interplay in the relations and responsibility of citizenship for both dominate and marginalized citizens. The following section will further explore the concept of the ‘other’ or (non)citizen and how this leads to abjection and marginalization.

3.3 Abjection and marginalization – Highlighting the ‘Other’

The examination of the political and going beyond the notion of the sovereign citizen to a consideration that an individual may act across and reproduce a multiplicity of citizenships regimes that are inclusive of both the spatial the temporal acknowledges the multiplicity of ways of knowing and doing of citizenship from the actor’s perspective (Hepworth, 2014; Isin, 2013). It allows for incorporation of the theories of social abjection and ‘abject spaces’ – the limited spaces of rights inclusion and belonging where abject citizens are rendered invisible and/or inaudible (Isin & Rygrel, 2007). “Flexible citizens”, Ong asserts, in their trans-nationality are often left in abject spaces, as our current models do not capture the “horizontal and relational nature of the contemporary economic, social, and cultural processes that stream across spaces…[nor] their embeddedness in differently
configured regimes of power” (1999: 4). Social constructivism allows for viewing citizenship from this lens and can highlight how this institution processes and practices can be inclusive or exclusive as it creates limited spaces of rights inclusion and belonging where abject or (non)citizens are rendered invisible or inaudible both horizontally and vertically (Tyler, 2013; Isin & Rygrel, 2007; Ong, 1999). The importance of this institutionalism cannot be ignored, and as many scholars, including Lister (2003), Kymlicka (2012) and Young (2000), insist these two approaches to citizenship must be bridged to provide a fuller more inclusive view.

Fanon (1993) contends ‘the others’ world view and view of self is expressed through the discourse of the colonizer, the civilizing nations of the imperial world (or contemporary continued settler colonialism); thus, he or she stops behaving as an “actional person”. As Foucault (2003) states in order to fight neoliberalism or in this case continued settler colonialism (i.e., the continuation of other-ing) and to defend society we need to bring to light what is abject, i.e., the (non)citizen. This in turn leads us to Tyler’s (2013) articulated notion of the ‘revolting subject’ or abject (non)citizen. This abjection, or disgust, Tyler argues is power in the most political sense. Inherently found in what Ahmed (2004) describes as a reliance upon discourses of history which tie this notion of disgust to specific objects and bodies (p.92), to continue the exclusionary processes and practices aimed at (non) citizens. Discourse, according to Foucault (1984; 1980), is power, and can be viewed not only as a language of subordination but also one of protection. Individuals and groups of citizens within society internalize these discourses, which in turn can be monopolized through social norms “emerging in a social theory of abjection wherein abjection is understood as a mechanism of governance through aversion” (Tyler, 2013: 37). What Tyler’s conceptual framework of abjection shows is that both the individual and the nation-state are nothing but a collection of actions of both citizens and (non)citizens. In the problematized context of continued settler colonialism abjection is a form of power as seen through the examination of the processes and practices of ‘othering’.

Similarly, Agamben (1998) argues that citizenship has always had two faces: “the bearer of subjection to sovereign power and individual liberties” (p.125). This creates a dualism within political life and forms of belonging – the citizenship elites and the “other” (see also Wiebe, 2014, Laforest, 1998). Harrington (2014) also argues that citizenship is dynamic, continually changing, and embodied in the struggle enacted through what people do. The globalizing nature of our current times makes us all ‘citizens of the world’, and therefore requires a dynamic flexible definition of citizenship that transcends the locus of nationhood (Lee, C. 2014). This is in alignment with emerging notions of citizenship in a
globalized world and the call for a more dynamic flexible re-construction of the praxis of citizenship that is inclusive of gender, social class, nationality, race, ethnicity, sexuality, and ability (Guillaume, 2014; Lee, C. 2014; Smith, 2012; Lister, 2003; Menzies, Adamoski & Chunn 2002; Young, 2000). Laforest (1998) asserts the continuation of the ‘spirit of imperialism’ parallels the continuation of exclusion or other-ing of Quebec and Indigenous peoples in Canada. He calls for utilizing the flexibility already inherently present within the Constitution Act of 1867 to move towards accepting “that the Other exists as the Other” (pp.67-68), and thus not privileging one section of the Canadian population over another. Thus, there is a need to examine the processes and practices of other-ing, the mechanisms, through which the ‘norms of abjection’ are created, operationalized, and then internalized (Tyler, 2013:37; Fanon, 1993). Therefore, the next section will explore these concepts of citizenship and abjection within the Canadian context.

3.3.1 Citizenship and Abjection in the Canadian Context of Continued Settler Colonialism

Abu Laban (2014) suggests a three-pronged approach to looking at citizenship in Canada: formal citizenship (formal legal status), substantive citizenship (elements of entitlement for individuals and groups) and citizenship belonging (elasticity and fluidity). After setting the scene with some historical context, using this tripartite framework I will review the concept of citizenship in Canada to further situate the re-problematized context of continued settler colonialism.

What constitutes citizenship is continually begin refined and redefined spatially and temporally with the Canadian Citizenship Act (Parliament of Canada, 1946). Canadian citizenship became a legal status separate from British nationality, and national sovereignty came in 1982 with the passing of Canadian Charter of Rights and Freedom legislation. Acts of government prior to this point had to be ratified by an act of the British parliament (Abu-Laden, 2014; Laforest, 1998). Abu-Laban argues that rights in Canada became more teleological in nature following a path towards greater equality (2004:21) following the evolutionary drive that Marshall (1965; 1950) claims society has made for hundreds of years towards social equality. However, it is also seen as a shift from the holistic interdependent nature of Indigenous societies to the modern philosophy of differential citizenship and ongoing abjection and struggle for self-rule of minority groups – both Francophone and Indigenous. National minorities’ desire for self-governance both shape them and shape civil society’s policy responses (Laforest, 1998; Kymlicka, 1995). However, as Fleras and Maaka argue, “Indigenous peoples are neither ethnic minorities with needs nor Canadian citizens
who happen to live on reserves. Rather they constitute fundamentally autonomous political communities who are sovereign in their own right with respect to land, identity, and political voice, yet sharing in sovereignty of society by way of concurrent jurisdictions of mutual concern” (2010:15).

Formal citizenship is restrictive, the ‘official’ version of the ‘legal’ rights of citizenship as defined by the state. The theme of ‘substantive citizenship’ explores a person’s ability to actualize said formal rights and thus must also be explored to understand the ‘white settler colony’ foundation of Canada and how it influences the notions and definitions of citizenship. Jenson and Phillips (1996) contend this foundation creates an additional space and legitimacy to pursue collective claims as part of the regime of citizenship in Canada. Abu-Laban points to how in the recent decades’ certain individual, group, and social rights have however been retracted (2007:21). Alternatively, Canadian scholars, Jenson, Bickerton and Gagnon (2014) among them, alternative used the term ‘citizenship regimes’ to draw attention and understanding to our national identity and sense of belonging. They highlight the relationship between (a) individuals, groups, and the state, (b) the rules that govern access to state institutions and services, and (c) a set of citizen rights and duties associated with citizenship. Jenson uses this term to show the evolution of social citizenship in Canada has led to the further abjection of national minorities (Jenson and Phillips, 1996; Jenson, 1997). Ward (2014) emphasizes that Canada’s settler colonial history has led to a ‘fractured Western identity’ that still resides in Canada’s present. This imposition of a persistent structure of colonial power creates and continues to dominate society that is spatial, racialized, and gendered (pp. 65-67, 77-78), a state of continued settler colonialism.

Lastly, the theme of citizenship belonging will be explored because the historical, social, and political context within which the dialogue of citizenship in Canada occurs is complex and fraught with power struggles that have led to concepts such as multiculturalism or differentiation as well as the abjection of many of its (non)citizens. Built on state-building mythology with settler-colonial foundations political, legal, and social power relationships perpetuate the state of continued settler colonialism in Canada. Canada has two separate pieces of governing legislation that divide citizens based solely on a question of race or status. The Indian Act 1876 is a controversial piece of legislation, one that has been described as apartheid and a human rights abuse. It has had severe, lasting, and negative political, legal, economic, and social impacts. Indigenous leaders, under the Indian Act, are elected by their people but beholden to a Ministry in Ottawa not to the citizens in their local communities (see sections 74, 76, and 78 of the Act). This overarching negative synergy creates a tangible
sense of entitlement, nepotism, lateral violence\textsuperscript{8}, and civic apathy in remote rural Indigenous communities (Gale, 2007) and conflicting historical narratives of who is a citizen and/or who is Canadian (Helin, 2011, 2008; Hansen, 2009; Ladner, 2008; Saul, 2008). In the case of Canada and places with colonial histories, there is a system of power that is based on a preconceived notion of racial superiority for white Settlers and all other populations are surplus or abject (Tyler, 2013; p.19). Tyler does point out the disconnection between the “colonized subject (abject)” and the Indigenous person’s own “experience of themselves as human none the less” (p.44). Despite Canada’s seemingly more conciliatory or reconciliation set of discourses Coulthard (2014) argues the relationship of the state to Indigenous people has and continues to remain foundationally colonial; and thus, so does the relationship between Settler and Indigenous citizens.

Many scholars, Indigenous and non, argue there is nothing “post” about colonialism (i.e., Coulthard, 2014; Lowman & Barker, 2015; Palmater, 2015; Veracini, 2015; Wolfe, 2006). In Canada it has simply morphed to fit the contemporary context of continued settler colonialism, a claim Lowman and Barker argue can be located within the national ideology, “the spaces, systems, and stories build on stolen land” (2015: 24). As Wolfe (2006) contends the characteristics of settler colonialism are based on the colonial logics of elimination of Indigenous societies for the primary aim of increased access to territory and is not a complex social formation therefore it is not an event but a structure of dissolution and assimilation. Veracini (2015) further claims settler colonialism “necessitates a sovereign displacement” giving rise to a whole new permanent society through an isopolitical shift. Therefore, Settler society that are not migrants nor somewhere else but are intent to stay and this new also Settler society requires an abject exogenous other and seeks its own end. Thus, it is not finished. “Rather, it continues to happen because the social, political, and economic structures built by the invading people endure… [as do the] narratives of progress and racial or cultural superiority” (Lowman & Barker 2015: 25-26).

Initial cooperation and shifts in trade due to disease and increased dispossession and displacement as two worldviews clash create prejudices and stereotypes in the colonial pursuit of access to land and resources. According to Canada’s Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996) the concept of \textit{terra nullius}, ‘nobody’s land’ or empty land, is

\textsuperscript{8} Lateral violence is defined in Gale (2007) as “where a people of community turn on their own”; here the concept is more nuanced to also included the notion of “abusing in ways one was abused”. Lateral violence is also seen to be a direct result of colonial logics and mechanisms like the \textit{Indian Act 1876} and Indian Residential School experience.
used to justify this dispossession despite Indigenous peoples being self governing societies for millennia before Settlers arrived. This legal concept is extended under colonialism to lands not possessed by ‘civilized’, or Christian, people and furthered under the Catholic Doctrine of Discovery, a 1493 Papal decree where Pope Alexander asserts the right to colonize, convert, and enslave. The Assembly of First Nations (2018) position paper asserts the doctrine was based on a presumed racial superiority and was applied as the legal and moral justification for the dispossession of Indigenous lands in what was to become Canada. The Royal Proclamation of 1763 confirms this principle of *terra nullius*, that no one ‘owned’ the land prior to European arrive via the Doctrine of Discovery under which according to Borrows (2015) “lands were declared to be legally empty, allowing European law to control Indigenous peoples” (2015:702). Also, land that is ‘unoccupied’, or used seasonally, could thus be pre-empted and title issued after, as seen in the example from the Tśilhqot’in War section. The *Tśilhqot’in Nations v. British Columbia* (2014) does address the doctrine as it relates to *terra nullius* but Borrows warns in the Supreme Courts declaration that it never applied to Canada is a legal fiction as, “Canadian law still has *terra nullius* written all over it” (2015:702). However, despite Borrows caution, he asserts this case “is one of the most important” but that it is just one step towards un/decolonizing not the complete journey as Canadian law remains problematic (ibid:741). As Reid (2010) contends Canada’s sovereignty is ‘theoretical’ and that rights recognized under the Royal Proclamation of 1763 and entrenched in the Constitution of 1985 are ‘double edged’. They protect the rights to use and occupy while reinforcing and further establishing the Doctrine of Discovery and the Crown’s claims to pre-emptive right to sovereignty and title of the land. Therefore, continued settler colonialism is not colonialism, but instead is defined here using the work of Wolfe (2006), Veracini (2015; 2010), and Lowman and Barker (1025) as requiring a sovereign displacement to generate a new people, a Settler society, as a structure not an event, as needing an abject exogenous other, as permanent occupancy, and as not finished.

Indigenous peoples of North America have robust axiologies, methodologies, ontologies, and epistemologies “that reinforced the interdependency of tribal members to each other to the highest degree [despite this] assimilation…became the fundamental objective of European and colonial governments” (Helin, 2008: 86). Indigenous scholars in Canada therefore continue to view contemporary state practices within Canada as a perpetuation of colonialism and with the ongoing presence of the *Indian Act 1876* as a perpetuation of settler colonialism. It is also known as the ‘big lie’ of the white-Settlers and a denial of the inherent rights of First Nations to be self-governing (Battiste and Semaganis,
This leaves many Indigenous people and leaders frustrated and continually fighting for survival – emotionally, spiritually, physically, and culturally – as a result of past and present manifestations of colonial practices.

As Tully’s conversations with Indigenous Elders demonstrates, First Nations identity and their ways are directly related to the places and spaces they inhabit (2008:250). Wiebe (2014) aims to draw attention to the richness of citizens’ place-based acts to demonstrate how they highlight individual agency and external colonial power. Place-based acts Wiebe argues are a ground up practice, and I also argue a ground up process, for forming power relations. They also enable the exploration of how an abject citizen problematizes formal citizenship, rights, and are also rooted within an ontological connection to place. Tully, (2008) further attests place is at the core of Indigenous identity embodied and rooted in the territorial processes and practices of place-based relational accountability and responsibility. Place-based ‘citizen-acts’ could have the potential to impact the phenomenon of continued settler colonialism in Canada to re-dress the relationship between Settler and Indigenous citizens, and to re-capture and redefine abject spaces in order to ensure social citizenship is inclusive of Indigenous peoples’ right of self-determination. Similarly, Smith (2012) calls for the use of critical theory to decolonize the methodologies used to explore concepts like citizenship so they can be re-formed, re-captured or re-claimed. However, it is yet to be determined if existing approaches are flexible enough to be inclusive and decolonized or whether the inherent Western hegemonic influences on the citizenship debate will continue either exogenously or endogenously (Harrington, 2014; Guillaume, 2014; Lee C., 2014, 2010; Wiebe, 2014; Tyler, 2013; Arneil, 2007; Grewal, 2005; Falk, 2000). This concern harkens back to the concerns of all constructionists – which and whose interpretation of social reality will be counted or more heavily weighted.

I also struggle with the term ‘decolonize’ as a Settler woman of mixed heritage, and do not want to use this power term of repatriation of land and sovereignty as a metaphor. Rodríguez (2020) admits to being guilty of this; but reminds us all that “decolonization is for Indigenous people only”, and in order to keep from perpetuating the colonizing of decolonization by Settlers to as she advises “give back the term of decolonization to those that have been harmed by colonization the most – us, Indigenous people”. Therefore, in alignment with Rodríguez, I will use the term ‘uncolonize’ for Settlers, “the voluntary distancing, detaching from colonial morays” (ibid); and ‘decolonize’ for Indigenous peoples, groups, or communities, to avoid these terms become metaphors instead of value laden
phenomenon that require commitment and action in order to centre Indigenous voices, processes, and practices.

Therefore, this dissertation applies theories of citizenship, abjection or marginalization and civil society to explore the role of civil society organizations in the processes and practices of Indigenous and Settler lived experience of social citizenship within British Columbia and Yukon, Canada. The dualism mentioned in the introduction creates spaces of abjection or limited spaces of rights inclusion as citizenship becomes a political, legal, and social reality based solely on race or status not on principles of indigeneity. To explore this dualism, my doctoral research investigates what role Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) play in the lived experience of Indigenous and Settler individuals, groups or communities’ social citizenship processes and practices. The objective of my research is twofold: to investigate what these potential sites of interaction tell us about the perception and reality of the roles and agency in the lived experiences of processes of social citizenship; and, to explore if citizenship is rooted in “politics of solidarity in difference” as Lister (2003:199) argues, i.e. can citizens interactions challenge the historical colonial structures and ways of thinking inherent within Canadian context. I explore whether these types of associations are found within civil society and if they provide the opportunity for joint actions of citizens in civil society organizations when privilege and marginalized citizens come together to solve social problems, through the nested lived experience of the processes and practices of social citizenship. Based on the preceding literature review, the following are definitions for the purposes of my research of the first two theoretical concepts that will be used. First, citizenship is seen as a process of critical synthesis of its institutional (status and rights) and social construction (practice and participation) aspects found within the acts or agency of citizens and (non)citizens rooted in space, place, and recast or reimagined over time (Kymlicka 2012; Smith, 2012; Isin & Nielson, 2008; Lister, 2003; Young, 2000) and I argue nested in the sociohistorical context and lived experience of citizens and (non)citizens. Second, abjection or marginalization as defined by and seen in the limited spaces of rights, inclusion, and belonging (Tyler, 2013; Smith, 2012; Young, 2000; Laforest, 1998). Finally, I explore the literature and construct definitions for the final piece of the empirical puzzle: civil society and civil society organizations.

3.4 Civil Society – The Space Between

Kymlicka (2012) argues that the origins of ‘multicultural citizenship’ – including minority and Indigenous citizenship – are found in the process of turning “uncivil relations into liberal-democratic relationships, both in terms of the vertical relationships between
members of minorities and the state, and the horizontal relationships among the members of
different groups” (p.60). It is the intersection of these horizontal and vertical relationships,
what Blair calls the “area between” that civil society inhabits “and it is made up of
associational groups of all kinds” (1977:24). It is within this “space between” that that
“democracy in action” happens as it allows marginalized citizens, if the process is open and
fair, “to persuade their fellow citizens of the justice or wisdom of their cause” (Young,
2000:3). It is a concept that is vastly debated and according to Keane (2003) actors within
‘global civil society’ constantly interact, communicate, and redefine this temporary assembly
of conflicted civility through interlinking social processes, practices, and structured social
action. Skocpol (2003) asserts that it is within civil society that groups learn and practice how
to operate, collectively debate, and make decisions around public issues. Thus, as Lewis
(2001) points out the concept of civil society has historical depth with regard to the study of
citizenship, exclusion, and colonialism. Therefore, in this section I will briefly explore some
of the theories and arguments with regard to what is civil society, provide a definition of civil
society for the purposes of this research, and then move to an exploration of civil society
organizations (CSOs).

Against the binary trend of current civil society debate of seeing the concept as a
zero-sum relationship, arguing that CSOs take up the slack in what the state decides to adopt
or relinquish, Keane (2003) calls instead for a blurring of the line between national and global
dimensions towards a socially constructed view of constant intersection and codetermination
at all levels – macro, meso, and micro (p.24). Keane (2003) argues civil society is an
intentional construct or ‘cognitive type’. A socially produced or constructed ‘ideal’ of the
“myriad of elements of a complex social reality…an unfinished project…with the deliberate
aim of drawing the world together in new ways” (p.8). It has a duality of pluralism and
potential conflict. It is a heterogeneous space for the distribution of socio-economic power
through conflicted and contested power relations. Due to its history and colonial usage this
concept also has the capacity to be considered “conceptual imperialism”, a Western-centric
agent of power and influence (see Kaviraj & Khilnani, 2001). However, Keane (2003)
articulates that as this concept traveled beyond its original context civil society has been
“conceptualized or re-conceptualized in local terms” (p.36) to become defined as “multiple
and multi-dimensional” within the global context (p.39).

Civil society is also regarded by scholars as a ‘sphere’ or ‘arena’ (Fioramonti &
Kononykhina, 2015; Firoamonti & Firori, 2010; Heinrich & Fioramonti, 2007). It is defined
as a diverse social “phenomena of mass participation [that has] led to important changes in
political and social life” (Fioramonti et al., 2015: 468). Seen in this way, examples of “alternative civic action” allow us also to consider the political, economic, and social factors in localized examples of civic activism and how certain cultural particularities of civil society become predominant (ibid: 469). Kamat (2004) argues that civil society until the 1980s was used to refer to specific “private sectarian interests”, but there is a shift within the Global South to “the peoples’ interest” with civil society organizations (CSOs) as a way of mediating “the excesses of the state”. (p.157-158). This inversion does not align with the hegemonic neoliberal conceptions of civil society and these negotiations of private and public interest continue to be debated. Skocpol (2003) asserts that this is why civic leaders and organizations are so crucial for they provide the space and place for ordinary citizens to become involved in shared undertakings that can shift social identities and modes of organization. Fioramonti et al. argue this shared undertaking is vital as civil society “provides avenues and channels for citizens to organize and make their voices heard” (2015: 469). As a result, the authors insist that it is time to move beyond the limitation of the ‘form’ of civil society to the analytical approach of explanation and measurement of the ideal conditions for participation within the civil society arena (p.485). An advantage of this approach is that it can be inclusive of all characteristics of the multiform social phenomena of civil society and citizen or (non)citizen participation as the shift moves from form to conditions for action. Skocpol (2003) argues we need to ‘reinvent’ or re-construct the aspects of civil society including shared values, fellowship, and inclusive opportunities to participate in organized civil action.

Therefore, for the purposes of my research I define civil society as more than just voluntary organizations but in line with the communitarian tradition as the space between the state, market, and family life where citizens or competing social groups can negotiate, deliberate, or debate about the common good. This space between is a nested space of citizen-based praxis, sociohistorical context, and the lived experience of citizens and (non)citizens. Civil society seen as a complex social reality of alternative civic actions and voices, the ‘space between’ provides the opportunity to explore the nested processes and practices of civil action and/or citizen place-based action.

3.5 Civil Society Organizations (CSOs) – a spectrum of social agency

In this section, I will look at why CSOs, what CSOs are, and whose knowledge counts in CSOs. The duality of pluralism in politics and inclusion is seen as the best way for ‘democracy in action’ (citizen agency) to occur within civil society organizations (Young, 2000; Blair, 1997). This is argued as a way to ensure inclusive discourse and action in redressing or contesting abjection or injustice in society by providing the space and voice for
marginalized citizens to bring light to what they want to tell and get from government, society or their communities or organizations, in essence the opportunity for power. It is the intersection of association, founded within the subjective relationships among actors, their agency, perceptions, ethics, and values that dictates whether there is organization around an issue (Crowther, 2000). It must be localized, perceived to have value through the normative practices of all those involved (Crowther, 2000; Young, 2000; Blair, 1997). A process Smith (2012) calls ‘systematic fragmentation’ as ‘CSO-ism’ leads to what Choudry (2010) identifies an ‘ideology of pragmatism’ that reinforces historical and colonial exclusionary practices in knowledge production. The caution is not to romanticize CSOs but as Choudry and Kapoor argue to authentically and honestly “articulate and document knowledge production, informal practices, and education work that occurs in the everyday world of social activism, highlighting interconnection or dialectics between such knowledge and praxis or action, while illustrating tension over whose knowledge and voice(s) are heard” (2010: 2). If not, citizen action, social action, and activism can do the opposite of what is intended and in fact increase inequalities and abjectification despite people’s good intentions (Canovan, 2005; Skocpol, 2003; Crowther, 2000). There are indeed scholars and practitioners in the field who caution that civil society organizations may have a duality and promote both inclusionary and exclusionary process for marginalized (non)citizens (i.e., Choudry and Shragge, 2011; Young, 2000; Lewis and Wallace, 2000; Hulme and Edwards, 1997). Despite this Young (2000) argues civil society and CSOs “offers a way out of this circle, one of the only ways out” (p.165) of the differing silencing of the abject. For she asserts “associational life...serves as a basis of social solidarity, cultural support, or resistance to domination and oppression” (p.166). It is this potential that Lewis and Wallace (2000) articulate is within the scope of civil society organizations as a mechanism to address social injustices like poverty through “grassroots change”. The caution, however, is not to fall into the fallacy of treating civil society organizations as homogenous, what Howell and Pearce (2000) dub a “singular actor in opposition to the state [that] masks the division within civil society, the conflicting array of values and purposes, and the unequal power relations between particular groups” (p. 77). But what are CSOs; what is their purpose; whose knowledge counts within the interactions of privilege and abject citizens in CSOs social action and knowledge production?

In order to begin to unpack these questions we must explore how scholars and others define CSOs. These definitions are sometimes muddled as CSOs are also referred to as non-governmental organizations (NGOs). Previously analytical perspective and definitions of
CSOs often focus on what CSOs are not instead of focusing what they actually are a complex spectrum of heterogeneous social action that has the potential to include or exclude. For example, the United Nations establishes that CSOs “seek to bring about positive social and environmental change through advocacy groups, organizations in the field, multi-national, international or small grass-roots groups; but are not private sector, academic, labour or municipalities”. Although Blair also describes CSOs as non-governmental organizations, he states they that aspire to “public rather than private goals” and are typically, but not always, “volunteer groups concerned…with influencing state policy” (1997:24). Therefore, according to him all CSOs are NGOs but not all NGOs are CSOs. Definitions like these are often too limiting even in their diversity, too Western, and limited by the specific UN definition. For example, Martens (2002) identifies CSOs (i.e., NGOs) as non-profit but professionalized non-violent groups that can be international only or be seen more inclusive and working at all levels with all types of societal actors and are organizations without government representation that are free of state influence. I do not agree that CSOs are ‘international only’ or free of state influence as many CSOs do receive financial or moral support from the state; I do agree CSOs do not seek government power per say. Instead, I view CSOs as other scholars do, as organized around a localized or geographical issue or association (Blair 1997; Canovan, 2005; Choudry, 2010; Choudry & Kapoor, 2010; Crowther, 2000; Emejulu & Bassel, 2013; Howell & Pearce, 2000 Hulme & Edward, 1997; Kamat, 2004; Smillie, 2000; Smith, 2012; Vakil, 1997; Young, 2000). Examples include the guilds of the 1600s, trade unions, service clubs, non-profit organizations, or activist groups. In British Columbia there are thousands of CSOs, one example is Decoda Literacy Solutions and in the Yukon there are hundreds, one example is the Yukon Anti-Poverty Coalition. Thus, CSOs are argued here to also be a legal and sociological right reserved for citizens.

Despite the often grassroots or localized nature of many CSOs, the trend of systematic fragmentation and ideological pragmatism is further perpetuated by the globalization of CSOs – the international scale that also can further historical and colonial logics of power and abjection. Kamat (2004) argues against the globalization of CSOs/NGOs as they are actors not just simply products of democratic culture. However, as they increasingly step in to respond to the marginalization and abjection of certain people in society, Kamat cautions that there are few mechanisms to ensure accountability. They are increasingly becoming integrated into global capitalism moving towards private versus public good goals. It also demonstrates the illusion that civil society is separate from the market and state despite what is described as civil society’s structural reality. Further, she argues that advocacy
CSOs/NGOs can at times undermine the perceived sovereignty of a state when they challenge them on who truly represents the peoples’ interests. This duality of power to privilege or marginalize also raises questions of economic and donor support as a continuation of continued settler colonialism. This duality, the capacity for CSOs to include the abject and exclude marginalized voices in knowledge production and social action, I and many scholars agree upon (Canovan, 2005; Choudry, 2010; Choudry & Kapoor, 2010; Choudry & Shragge 2011; Crowther, 2000; Emejulu & Bassel, 2013; Howell & Pearce, 2000 Hulme & Edward, 1997; Kamat, 2004; Lewis & Wallace, 2000; Vakil, 1997; Young, 2000).

To combat this duality, “contestation” is what Choudry (2010) argues for as it will bring to light the silences within CSOs of Indigenous ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing that are demonstrated and found in the framing of social justices nationally and globally. Kamat (2004) also asserts this silencing leads to unequal power relations, marginalization through professionalization, and de-politicization as seen in the trend of marketization and/or privatization of education and health care making a strong case that it is ‘unlikely’ CSOs truly represent the public good. From a slightly different perspective, Vakil (1997) defines CSOs as “self-governing, private, not-for-profit organizations that are geared to improving the quality of life of disadvantaged people” (p.2060). She highlights the ICOs (Indigenous community organizations) impact on development has gone largely unanalyzed and therefore this is a compelling reason to include informal organizations within her definition of CSOs (1997: 2065). She uses her framework to show that these informal organizations need to be further researched to see the consequences when formalization occurs through a comparison of Western and non-western organizations. And could potentially be used a way of exploring if CSOs/NGOs are truly contributing to their primarily goal of improving the well-being of people.

Finally, Emejulu and Bassel (2013), Choudry and Kapoor (2000), Smillie (2000), Young (2000), and Vakil (1997) all characterize CSOs as a spectrum of social action and association, one of service delivery, volunteerism, and activism. By viewing the actions of civil society organizations as an inclusive spectrum of association we move towards a “people-centred [concept that] is about increasing not decreasing choice” (Smillie, 2000; 35). Choudry (2010) therefore maintains that within the Canadian context, researchers must use a ‘de-colonial lens’, and I argue an un-colonial one too, in defining concepts and pursuing case section (p.30). Doing so will also help to challenge the ‘professionalization’ that is occurring in this sector while also challenging ideas of whose knowledge counts within these ‘hegemonic positions’. Rodriguez contends that if we do not...
do this, we “confer a kind of authority on groups who do not necessarily represent the broader positions on whose behalf they claim to act” (2010: 55-56).

This calls for going beyond grassroots ideology to what Chapman (2010) calls the “complex web of relationships” required to address social injustices through collaborative efforts of civil society organizations. Going beyond to Young’s (2000) notion of democratic decision making in civil society organizations, which is dependent on the degree of inclusion and influence of those affected by both the processes and outcomes of said decision making practices. As Rodriguez (2010) states this will challenge “us to expand our political imaginaries to demand not simply more rights within the existing paradigms of citizenship but indeed, rights and citizenship of an entirely different order” (p.67). Thus, CSOs are defined and viewed as non-governmental organizations within third sector of civil society whose purposes include a spectrum of social action and association, from social service delivery to advocacy activities (Emejulu & Bassel, 2013; Choudry & Shragge, 2011; Choudry & Kapoor, 2010; Young, 2000; Blair, 1997). CSOs are also defined as part of the third sector, as non-governmental, not-for-profits with formal or informal structures that operate within the space between the state and the market in order to influence both.

I contend for the purposes of this research that CSOs require skills, means, and energies to promote shared ideas, they are a spatial social phenomenon that create a space in which all social actors have a voice towards self-determination of their own well-being. They are also non-governmental, represent public interest, aim to influence state actors and public opinion, and have the capacity to organize alternative associations and discourses through a spectrum advocacy and service or the distribution of resources. Also, I see CSOs like citizenship nested within the socio-historic context of the space and place this spectrum is enacted, embodied, and emplaced. Therefore, I propose to conduct a comparative case study of two CSOs to explore the role they play through service delivery or advocacy in the lived experiences of social citizenship processes and practices in the Pacific Northwest.

The next chapter will focus on the how I will conduct this analysis using a mixed qualitative methodology and an intersectional indigeneity approach to the exploration of the lived experience of the process and practices of social citizenship in the re-problematized context of continued settler colonialism in the Pacific Northwest of what is now Canada.
Chapter Four: Intersectional Indigeneity ~ A Mixed-Qualitative Approach

4.1 The Methodology of Whose Knowledge Counts

Whose knowledge counts. This query continues to resonate with me throughout the process of my doctoral research. It also resonates with Law’s argument on ‘methodological mess’, on how knowledge is constructed in specific historical context, how knowledge produces methods and, thus produces reality (2004; 5). This interlocking of epistemology and ontology also intersects with identity and agency and is neither acultural nor apolitical. Whose knowledge counts, when and how, helps define citizenship and social action and thus social citizenship processes and practices. As Kovach (2009) points out it is typically non-Indigenous researchers who examine Indigenous communities and people in accordance with Western norms and epistemic foundations; it is a deeply political pursuit (28-29). It is a form of elite knowledge extraction and construction I feel obligated to challenge, to continually ask what constitutes knowledge through contesting ongoing settler-centric history and continued settler colonial logics.

Steinhauer (2002) insists it is time to reframe, reclaim, and rename the research processes in adherence to Indigenous epistemologies. She also points out that dominant colonial paradigms are built on the belief that “knowledge is an individual entity” versus the Indigenous fundamental belief that “knowledge is relational…shared with all creation” (p.71). This chapter starts by looking into Indigenous methodologies which are based on Indigenous epistemologies, knowledges that are relational, interpretative, contextual, holistic, inclusive, and spatial temporal (Cajete, 1999; Deloria, 2002; Graveline, 2000; Henderson, 2000; Kovach, 2000; Kovach, 2009, 2010; Wilson, 2008). I do this to push for a further acceptance of subjective knowledges. From the interpretative perspective, “Indigenous epistemologies fit nicely within the narrative aspect of a constructivist paradigm” (Kovach, 2009: 30). This fits with my own view of society and the continual re-imagining and re-construction of social citizenship through social action, i.e., the processes and practices of citizens. My doctoral thesis thus weaves Western and Indigenous epistemologies together to privilege both as co-foundations of this knowledge production, thus honouring and acknowledging the mosaic of knowledges, multiple truths, and contextualized ontologies found within the research context.

The focus then shifts to the multi-epistemic lens of the mixed methods approach, or in a traditional Western academic sense this section is on research design. It will connect the interlocking theoretical concepts of indigeneity and intersectionality, social constructionism, and institutionalism. The conceptual framework is the foundation for the multiple or mix-
qualitative methods approach to my case study design is the conceptualization of social
citizenship discussed in chapter three. The mix-qualitative methodology is based on the
previous mentioned Settler and Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies of the
phenomenon. To fulfill my research aims and contribute to the literature on the lived
experience of social citizenship in civil society and fulfill the obligation of giving back to the
Indigenous research participants requires a congruency with Indigenous epistemologies,
being relationally accountable, and having respect for local protocols through awareness and
reflexivity. These are also key to the contestation and re-problematization of Canada as a
continued settler-colonial state.

This next section starts with the notion that ontology is messy, particularly given the
context of continued settler colonialism in what is now called Canada. As Kovach points out,
“Elders say that if it comes from the hearts and is done in a good way, our work will count”
(2009; 8). Therefore, the methodology is multi-epistemic for it uses methods that centre both
the Settlers’ epistemologies within discourse through an un/decolonizing analysis and
intersectional-indigeneity paradigm that centres Indigenous epistemologies (Tsilhqot’in in the
first case and Kwanlin Dün in the second case). It is a way to honour multiple knowledge
systems, a way of seeking understanding without harm that is reflexive and avoids
‘whitewashing’ or recolonizing through research. It helps me to mitigate my privilege
position as a researcher of mixed heritage, to act as an ally, to acknowledge that this research
is done within a Western system, and to honour the relational holistic voices of the research
participants in each case. To be reflexive, to tell truths in accordance with experiential
knowledge, I will situate myself in the research through a mini-narrative demonstrating
Graveline’s (2000) notion of knowledge of ‘self-in-relation’ highlighting how my
epistemology, ontology, and axiology intersect with this experience. I will also rationalize
how intersectional indigeneity allows me to describe and explore the ontological perceptions
and realities and space/place concerns of the participants through their roles and agency in
these lived experiences of social citizenship.

The chapter concludes with the research story, the ‘how’ of purposive and relational
case selection, data collection, and analysis. I describe how I came to the two case studies,
British Columbia with Rotary International through Write to Read BC and the Tsilhqot’in Nation (Tl’ësqox and Tl’etinqox) and the Yukon with the Child Development Centre of the
Yukon and Kwanlin Dün First Nations. Case selection is done on a ‘criterion’ sampling, as it
involved choosing sites that meet a predetermined criterion of importance (Patton, 2015) and
it is also ‘relational’. This ‘relational accountability’ (Wilson, 2008) is core to a multi-
epistemic methodology that privileges both Settler and Indigenous ways of knowing and doing. The story then shifts to a mini overview of the cases, the research questions and objective(s), description of ‘how’ of the multiple methods of data collection and sources that include participant observation, sharing circles and one-to-one conversations (i.e., semi-informal conversational interviews), organizational observation and documentation, and the macro and meso level legislation and documents. As Kovach (2010) and Thomas (2015) argue this type of conversation method adheres to Indigenous epistemologies more so than formal rigid interviews as it allows the research participants to tell their own stories in their own way and on their own terms. My doctoral research uses what Kovach (2010) calls a “mixed qualitative approach that utilizes an Indigenous methodology based upon [Tšilhqot’in and Kwanlin Dün epistemologies and protocols] for gathering knowledge and interpretation, and a non-Indigenous approach of thematic analysis for organizing data” (p.44). Indigenous methodologies arise from the spaces the research takes place (Wilson, 2001); therefore, finally I delve further into what I did analytically. This ‘how’ of the research not only flows from the theoretical framework laid out in the previous chapter but will also utilize an Indigenous intersectional-based approach (Clark, 2012) guided by the principles of indigeneity (Fleras & Maaka, 2010; 2005). The research involves both Settler and Indigenous research participants in what is now called British Columbia and the Yukon. Therefore, it requires a “bi-cultural theoretical perspective for interpreting and making meaning of participants’ stories” that uses a “Indigenous relational theoretical approach … to offer a relational analysis … [based on] western culture’s relational intersection with Indigeneity” (Kovach, 2010: 45).

Research that includes an Indigenous methodology is ethically bound to examine the inherent colonial relationship through a critical un/decolonizing lens (Kovach, 2009; Smith 2012). I use the principle of intersectionality, indigeneity (Fleras & Maaka, 2010) and OCAP: ownership, control, access, and possession (Schnarch, 2004) to guild my research story, to avoid essentializing the research participants’ lived experiences. It links the theoretical conceptual framework to the strategy for interpretation and relational/reflexive engagement adapted from Kovach (2010) as the findings are thematically analyzed vertically and horizontally, separately, and then comparatively. It enables me to also consider and raise the questions of validity for who and by whom, or whose validity counts, throughout the process.

4.2 Towards a Multi-epistemic Mixed Qualitative Methods Approach

The Canada’s Royal Commission on Aboriginal Peoples (1996) states, “the gathering of information and subsequent use are inherently political”. As Schnarch (2004) points out,
Indigenous peoples are ‘researched to death’ by non-Indigenous researchers and the classical extractive research is often done without their consent or knowledge. This raises the questions of who will profit professionally and economically, will it be done in a good way or with ill intent, will it be deemed valid and by whom and how, and will the cultural material be presented out of context and inaccurate conclusions drawn based on colonial epistemologies. This research thus follows the principles of indigeneity, intersectionality, and OCAP. Thus, knowledge shared from the Indigenous research participants is owned, controlled, accessible, and possessed collectively and the results of this research will be gifted back to each of the organizations, communities, and individual research participants. This section will therefore provide highlights from the literature from both Western/Settler and Indigenous methodological perspectives to build the case for a mix-qualitative methods approach. Doing so will also bring to light how the two perspectives differ and converge in regard to process and content situating the discussion and this research within the qualitative landscapes of both. It facilitates the research aim as Indigenous ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing are also centred in the methodology through principles of indigeneity, indigenous intersectionality, and OCAP. Thus, an intersectional indigeneity approach also allows me to consider political and social conditions within this re-problematized context, to be reflexive and critical, and to articulate, and to construct different types of solutions that do not further impede, subjugate, or re-colonize. It also enables me to centre previously ignored or excluded voices of Indigenous and Settler women as the colonial cannon that is typically Settler-male centric or is focused on central or eastern Indigenous lived experiences in what is now called Canada (Hancock, 2007; Holmes, Hunt, & Piedalue, 2014; Hunt 2013; 2014).

As Davis (2004) points out, stories are historical, spiritual, social, and spatial. Research can be seen as specialized storytelling, which is a ‘rule-governed’ process where only certain stories are accepted or constructed as truth and knowledge. Smith (2012) postulates research as an inherently colonial practice for despite researchers ‘good intentions’ research relationships continue to mirror historical power relationships seen through non-Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies. Hence why the ethical design is grounded in principles of OCAP, along with as Wilson (2008) asserts notions of respect, ‘relational accountability’, and reciprocity. “Ethical protocols in research respond to the political dimension of research within Indigenous contexts and protect against extractive approaches to research” (Kovach, 2009: 127). They also correspond and works with cultural and place-based protocols.
Cooper (2016) argues intersectionality, a term coined by Kimberlé Crenshaw in 1989, is the accounting of power in structured identities arising from a long history of black feminist theorizing about interlocking systems of power, oppression, and agency. Intersectionality is about demonstrating the ways dimensions of inequality such as gender, class, race, sexuality are woven with socially defined categories such as sexuality, age, or nationality to explore how they can privilege or abjectify (Crenshaw, 1989; Winker and Degele, 2011). Winker and Degele (2011) argue what is ambiguous is “which levels these reciprocal effects apply: the level of social structures, the level of constructions of identity or the level of symbolic representation” (p.51) as all three of “these structural levels…are linked through the social practices of individuals” (p.56). I would also argue for social processes. As Davis (2008) reminds us it is a contested uncertain ambiguous theory. A term that is seen originally as ‘cross roads’ by Crenshaw (1991) and then is refined as ‘axes of difference’ by Yuval-Davis (2006), or as ‘dynamic processes’ by Staunæs (2003) or as ‘the specificity of difference’ by Mohanty (1984; 2002), or as ‘lived experience’ by Valentine (2007), or as ‘social ontologies’ or the ‘ways the world is organized’ by Anthias (2012). Davis postulates that intersectionality coincides with Foucauldian notions of power and is “ideally suited to the task of exploring how categories of race, class, and gender are intertwined and mutually constitutive, giving centrality to questions like how race is ‘gendered’ and how gender is ‘racialized’, and how both are linked to the continuities and transformations of social class” (2008: 71). Each new intersect highlights hidden interlocking oppressions, power, and agency. As argued by Bilge (2013) intersectionality needs to reconnect with counter hegemonic knowledge production processes and practices to ensure the examination of the coexisting notions of equality and “the persistence of deeply entrenched inequalities of race, class, gender, sexuality, ability, and citizenship-status” (p.407).

Naples (2009) insists an intersectional framework goes beyond “attention to historical, cultural, discursive, and structural dimensions that shape the intersections of race, class, gender, sexuality, national, and religious identify, among other identities… to include attention to the ways in which these interactions produce contradictions and tension” (p.567). Difference is then conceptualized here as Brah and Phoenix (2004) argue “as social relation; experience; subjectivity; and identity” (p.83). This is critical to the exploration of how CSOs facilitate or hinder the lived experience of social citizenship as this type of analysis could bring attention to how the interaction between Settler and Indigenous citizens within these spaces and places produce contradictions and tension. It aligns as is attuned to the space between as a place to explore identity and oppression shaped by the intersects of lived
experiences of the multiple dimensions of cultural sites, social processes, and group politics (Nash, 2008). Insights from an intersectional perspective have the potential to enable CSOs to question under what circumstances or conditions does seeking alliance, participation or partnership make sense as well as how to act or align processes and practices across and beyond difference to foster opportunities for power sharing. These insights also, as Bedolla (2007) argues, show how the lived experience of privilege and abjection shapes our social and political landscapes. Therefore, I will use Anthias positioning of intersectionality as positing “that social division interrelate in terms of production of social relations and in terms of people’s lives…within temporal and spatial contexts” (2012:2&6) to guide this research design. This method of analysis will enable me to look at the lived experiences of enacted, embodied, and emplaced social citizenship practices and processes and how they relate in the context of each other as acts of power that privilege or abject.

A facilitated dialogue on indigeneity and intersectionality at the Wosk Centre for Dialogue (Hunt, 2012) builds on the assertion by other Indigenous scholars that “Indigenous worldviews are inherently intersectional” as they “already include ways of expressing the interconnectedness of all things and various forms of knowledges” (pp.1-2). Intersectionality is seen as a new word for old knowledge, a way of exploring the tensions and connections between knowledge systems or for making sense of colonialism or continued settler colonialism. However, there is caution from those participating in the Wosk Centre’s dialogue in the applicability of a non-Indigenous academic framework that can be exclusive and that raises questions of its usefulness for understanding axis of power and coloniality without ensuring an indigenized lens. They assert concepts like interconnectedness and interrelatedness of Indigenous ways of being, knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing show how concepts of intersectionality already exist in Indigenous worldviews but that these ways, their indigeneity, takes a central place.

Fleras and Maaka (2010) demonstrate that the politics of indigeneity are at the forefront of continued settler colonial spaces like Canada due to systematic, institutional, and foundational marginalization and abjection. They point out that the socially constructed value laden process of policy-making privileges Settler norms and delegitimizes Indigenous claims to sovereignty (ibid: 2). Indigeneity, thus, can be considered a paradox and is found in the teachings, stories, laws, ceremonies and spiritual processes and practices, and place-based acts or actions tied to the land that honour the ancestors and generations yet to come (Wosk Centre for Dialogue, 2012; Hunt, 2013; Clark, 2012). For the purposes of this research, indigeneity is defined as Indigenous ways of being, ways of knowing and doing, ways of
perceiving and valuing. Indigeneity is a key concept as it’s principles further highlight these intersects of gender, race, class, and colonization (Clark, 2012; Fleras & Maaka, 2010; Hunt, 2013) to explore interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in the lived experience of social citizenship. Principles of indigeneity Fleras and Maaka argue “inform and legitimize” and their principled framework includes: “indigenous difference, indigenous rights, indigenous sovereignty, indigenous belonging and indigenous spirituality (including traditional knowledge)” (2010:14). As Hunt argues indigeneity is more than a set of ideas, it is “lived, practiced, and relational” (2013:3), embedded and embodied in place-specific processes and practices. By utilizing an indigeneity grounded analyze I can explore to what level these CSO research sites and their policies are informed by and legitimize indigenous difference, indigenous rights, indigenous belonging, indigenous self-determination, and indigenous spirituality.

Isin and Neilson (2008) argue it will be within actual “citizenship action” that privileged and marginalized citizens will experience of how power, gender, class, race and ethnicity in the relations and responsibilities of citizens. By situating the lived experience of the practices and processes of social citizenship within this un/decolonized and indigenized framework, I am attempting to give voice to the abject and to the narrative that needs to be told. Further, Canada’s Crown duty to consult with Indigenous peoples, and the government and legal precedent of doing so, bolsters the rationale for including an intersectional indigeneity-based analysis within this research theoretical conceptual framework. This type of analysis allows me to recognize that the policies that govern the social action of the CSOs under investigation not only influence the interaction with those they serve, i.e., the research participants, but are grounded in the social contexts within which they occur. Intersectional indigeneity allows Indigenous world views and Indigenous women’s voices to be highlighted as well as the roles of colonization, continued settler colonialism, and the multiplicity of lived experiences of social citizenship. This approach not only allows me to explore how Settler epistemologies can be made visible through the lens of un-colonizing and decolonization but also how Indigenous epistemologies are made visible through the lens of resistance and resilience (Clark, 2012; Fleras & Maaka, 2010; Hunt, 2013; Rodriguez 2020) through an intersectional indigeneity grounded comparative case study.

As Kovach (2009) points out, a researcher can mix the methods, using both Indigenous and Western inquiry techniques and tools. “The data can be coded, emergent themes grouped and bracketed, and so forth, while transparently indicating that this is not an Indigenous epistemological approach to data analysis” (p.35). This is a strategic concession,
it allows my research to adhere to and be respectful of local community or organizational protocols, acknowledge and honour multiple place-based relations, and maintain an un/decolonizing reflexive lens while allowing me to fulfill the requirement of a dissertation in a Western academic setting. By using multiple methods, both Indigenous and Settler, the research also has a mix of characteristics. It mixes the necessary epistemically academic characteristics of an interdisciplinary doctoral thesis and epistemically Indigenous characteristics, and thus it is relational, purposive, informal, flexible, partially dialogic, reflexive, adaptive, and adheres to place-based protocols (Kovach, 2010).

Kovach (2009) contends that methodologies are nested ontologically, epistemologically, and with the very methods themselves and what sets Indigenous methodology apart is the centring of Indigenous epistemologies. She further asserts, “Indigenous methodologies can be situated within qualitative landscapes because they encompass characteristics congruent with other relational qualitative approaches…[and] in research design [that] values both process and content. This matters because it provides common ground for Indigenous and non-Indigenous researchers to understand each other” (ibid:25).

From a Western perspective, King, Keohane and Verba (1994) argue in making case selection based on the dependent variable a researcher must ensure the dependent variable has other values and therefore a dissimilar design is chosen. A critical sampling strategy that uses the definitions theorized previously is used to ensure representation of the central phenomenon (Patton, 1990). A dissimilar design allows for inferences through narrative exploration of the lived experience of social citizenship. It also allows me to highlight any interesting or intervening variables as I moved from the deductive theoretical prepositions to the inductive process of data analysis within each case and across cases (Yin, 2014; George & Bennett, 2004; Kaarbo & Beasley, 1999; King, Keohane & Verba 1994). Purposive or criterion sampling allows me to focus on relevant features that allow for the selection of a sample population selected for a specific reason (Ritchie, et al., 2014; Kovach, 2009; Somekh & Lewin, 2005). George and Bennett (2004) demonstrate that case selection on the dependent variable can help identify which variables are not necessary, as well as ‘sufficient conditions for selected outcomes’; such selection may also identify possible causal pathways and models that could be tested in further research.

Creswell and Miller (2000) and Creswell (2003) establish reflexivity as a marker of validity within qualitative research, along with triangulation, disconfirming evidence, member checking through systematic checks of data and narrative with participants, prolong
engagement, collaboration, thick rich description, and peer debriefing. The meaning making process is therefore also grounded to some extent in these nine western principles with particular focus on Pillow’s notion of unconformable reflexivity mentioned above and the notion of self-in-relation to the research. Pillow (2003) argues that this type of ‘uncomfortable reflexivity’ allows a researcher to both challenge the construction of data while “acknowledging the political need to represent and find [alternative] meaning” (p.192).

A mixed-method qualitative approach offers both the opportunity for interpretative meaning-making and some form of thematic analysis. Yin (2014) defines thematic analysis, or explanation building, as a type of pattern matching that builds explanation (p.147). Yin (2014) also argues explanation building or process tracing includes the following: initial theoretical proposition(s), comparison of proposition(s) to findings, revising of proposition(s), comparison of revision to findings within the same case and then across other cases and repeating as necessary (p.149). First, however I would like to acknowledge the limitations of using explanation building as an analytical technique. It is iterative in nature and requires insight and sensitivity (Vaughan, 1992). Yin (2014) argues this can lead to selective bias, but this can be combated through constant rechecking finding with the research aim and having external critical confirmation of the analytical findings through a variety of checks for validity.

As Wilson (2001) contends research is about building something for self and community through relationships and discovering possibility based on the concept knowledge is relational. Therefore, Indigenous methodologies are about relational accountability, so research is not simply extractive but “mixing, gathering, sharing and analysis… [to come] to an agreement about a mutually understood idea” (p.179). Preparation in Indigenous methodologies is as Kovach states an “interpersonal, relational preparation (participation in ceremony, visiting community)” (2010: 46). Wilson (2009) expands on this asserting the lens is relationality as does Kovach (2009; 2010). This lens incorporates Weber-Pillwax’s (1999; 2001) key features, the 3R’s of Indigenous research and learning: respect, reciprocity, and relationality. Wilson asserts “Indigenous research is a ceremony and must be respected as such” (2009: 60). “Respect does not simply mean knowing and following basic rituals and practices as part of the protocols of interactions with indigenous people. It means believing and living that relationship with all forms of life and conducting all interactions in a spirit of kindness and honesty” (Weber-Pillwax, 1999:41). Wilson sums it up this way, “an Indigenous research paradigm is relational and maintains relational accountability” (2009:70) based on an “Indigenous epistemology built upon relationships between things, rather than on
the things themselves …[and] is our systems of knowledge in their context, or in relationship” (ibid:74). All of this is important as it helps me as a non-Indigenous researcher to always be aware of the power relations in order to continually develop a more culturally responsive relational place-based praxis, so I am more relationally accountable and able to meet the research purpose and aim.

Kovach’s work provides a map and lays out the key aspects and distinctive qualities of Indigenous methodologies that include: “(a) holistic epistemology, (b) story, (c) purpose, (d) the experiential, (e) tribal ethics, (f) tribal ways of gaining knowledge, and (g) an overall consideration of the colonial relationship” (2009: 44). In Indigenous methodology principles of validly go beyond Pillow’s uncomfortable reflexivity to what Kovach asserts also include access to process via the story and narrative, via reviewing and approving transcripts, via an ongoing relationship, via relational accountability, via respect for protocols and collective responsibilities, and via place. “Validity, then, is determined by methodology and community” (2009:149). For Wilson research is ceremony and Indigenous methodology is a lived and practiced relational accountability (2008) based on Weber-Pillwax (1999) three Rs. “A researcher must make sure that the three R’s – Respect, Reciprocity and Relationality – are guiding the research” (Weber-Pillwax as cited in Steinhauer, E., 2002: 73). As Weber-Pillwax also argues that research including non-Indigenous and Indigenous participants would profit from considering the following principles “(a) the interconnectedness of all living things, (b) the impact of motives and intentions on person and community, (c) the foundations of research as lived Indigenous experience, (d) the groundedness of theories in Indigenous epistemologies, (e) the transformative nature of research, (f) the sacredness and responsibility of maintaining personal and community integrity, and (g) the recognition of languages and cultures as living processes” (1999: 31-32).

Therefore, within the overall research design in accordance with these research principles and data construction underwent a variety of validity checks. ‘Relational accountability’ allows for trust to be built upon or built quickly. This in turn leads to enriching conversations that provided insight into the agency and the research participants’ lived experience of social citizenship at these sites of interactions. Also, this ‘relational accountability’ ethically obliges me to consider, particularly as an adopted member of Tl’ésqóx, the responsibly I have to protect the knowledge I have been gifted or that is shared with me. I am only a learner in relation to language and epistemology of Tšilhqot’in and a complete outsider in relation to Kwanlin Dün. As such, I must reflexively and respectfully incorporate my limited understanding with caution ensuring that I have permission to share
what I have learnt or what has been already documented in the public domain. This is about ‘self-in-relation’ and ‘self-in-location’ to the research and to its aim.

4.3 Continued Settler Colonialism: An Ontological ‘Mess’ Through an Un/Decolonial Lens

Knowledge is about ‘self-in-relation’; is it personal, political, and contradictory (Graveline, 2000). It is about being aware and reflexive, acknowledging the process of self-location, considering the insider/outsider position as researcher; it is about knowing and honestly articulating the purpose (Kovach, 2009: 50). My motivations, both academically and personally, guide my inquiry as does my self-in-relation to these actions, thoughts, and narratives. As a researcher of mixed heritage raised in the Settler culture of Canada, I argue that an intersectional-indigeneity approach will also allow me to consider political and social conditions within this problematized continual settler colonial context, as well as to be reflexive and critical, and to articulate and construct different types of perception and interpretation as well as possible solutions that do not further impede, subjugate, or re-colonize. By situating the lived experiences of the processes and practices of social citizenship within a continued settler colonial context, I am attempting to give voice to the ‘other’ and construct counter narratives that need to be told. It is also building on the argument of Rodriguez (2000) and the position previously stated on using un-colonizing (Settler) and/versus decolonizing (Indigenous) is also key to the methodological choices. Kovach (2010) reminds us un/decolonizing paradigms still “centre the Settler discourse, where Indigenous paradigms centres Indigenous knowledges” (p.42) enacted, embodied, and emplaced in what is the “relational dynamics between self, others, and nature” (ibid). Thus, the methodological choices are aligned with the research aim of centring the often abject or marginalized voices and to do this I feel I must honour the relational view, the intersects, and connections throughout this experience.

Philosophically, I strive to do Aristotelian ‘real good’, to do no harm and to never intentionally impede others movement, towards the ideal of becoming a Nietzschean ‘over-woman’ in the continual pursuit of the values of social justice through ‘service above self’ (Aristotle, 2005; 2005a; Nietzsche, 1967). Although at heart I appear to be an idealist, my experiential knowledge has given me pragmatist tendencies, therefore I consider myself an ontological mediativist. Adler (1997) argues mediativist are “ontological realists who believe that reality is affected by knowledge and social factors” (p.324). Epistemologically I align more with a constitutive position within the social constructivist approach as this allows me to argue that social citizenship processes and practices are reflective of and affected by
formulated conceptualizations of who is a citizen or (non)citizen in the continual settler colonial Canadian context. It also aligns with an Indigenous paradigmatic concept of knowledge as relational, that reality, one’s ontology, is based on relationships (Kovach, 2009, 2010; Wilson, 2001).

Due to my mixed heritage and being brought up in Settler society in accordance with Settler epistemologies and ontologies, I continually strive to un/decolonize my ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. As such, and similarly to Knudson (2015), I see myself as a non-Indigenous mixed heritage researcher with Settler citizen privilege committed to critical social research and social justice, using self-in-location to work as an ally towards the purpose of indigenizing my research and work (both teaching and community development). I am still an outsider to Indigenous epistemologies and ontologies as I still view my self as a learner regarding the multiple worldviews of North America. Often, I must justify myself in multiple worlds, multiple ontologies. There is a relational affinity between the inclusion of Indigenous knowledges and the examination of marginalization and abjection, power and privilege, and the strength and resilience of resistance to colonialism.

The fact that I am Canadian highlights the biases of my scholarly discourse which are most influenced by the social conditions and political debates from the Indigenous perspectives of North America, the colonial legacy of France and Great Britain, and the Settlers that contribute to the democratic practices and processes of Canada. As similar historical and social conditions can be found in other places, it is my hope that the proposed research may provide another way of exploring the role of civil society organizations in the lived experience of social citizenship processes and practices within other contexts. By using social constructivist institutionalism, intersectionality, indigeneity principles, and un/decolonial approaches to frame this research design I can be both critical and problem-solving regarding social action in this context.

I see my research design methodologically as represented by the theoretical conceptualization created in Figure 4.1 below. This theoretical conceptualization and multi-epistemic approach allow for the research to be nested within the problematized context of continued settler colonialism and enables the ‘how’ of the research to centre contested counter hegemonic narratives of both privilege and abjection. “Postcolonial? There is nothing post about it. It has simply shape-shifted to fit the contemporary context” (Kovach, 2009: 76). Postcolonialism discourse is thus seen as simply another way to deny the continued existence of systematic colonialism and racism. Colonization, Lewis attests, is a
continual reality for Indigenous people around the world, “it is not past, it is now, every day and every moment” (2016: 192). Story telling is an act of resistance, it is centre to

Figure 4.1: Interconnected Theoretical Framework – Nested Concepts

un/decolonizing theory and practice (Lewis, 2016; Sium & Ritskes, 2013; Smith, 2012; Kovach, 2009). The fluid and dynamic role non-Indigenous research must be that of ally, a contextual and relational role. Thus, un/decolonizing is not a metaphor but an ongoing praxis towards the repartition of Indigenous land and life (Lewis, 2016; Tuck & Yang, 2012).

Research thus becomes culturally responsive praxis. This theoretical framework allows me to be critical in theorizing and acknowledging that the knowledge or data findings will be constructed. Menzie (2001) reminds researchers that they are in a position of power and should not pursue increasing this power at the expense of the marginalized or abjectified, i.e., the colonized. This is a challenge that is simultaneously personal, institutional, and political (ibid: 20).

Risky stories, Davis says, are told in contested spaces where stories about Indigenous experience are told and interpreted through non-Indigenous lenses (2004:10). In such contested space as these two research cases represent, research protocols are key. One must
be respectful, be seen, listen more than one speaks, be gracious, be cautious, be humble, and put the collective needs before the individual ones (ibid: 11-12). It is our role as researchers to bear witness, to ensure our practice is ethical, culturally responsive and born of ‘relational accountability’ through awareness of the power we hold. To become what Davis calls “a less ignorant outsider” to push beyond the “mythical view of knowledge creation as existing outside the complex power relations that characterize the continuing story of colonization” (ibid: 15-16).

Marshall and Rossman (2011) point out research designs are driven by our research question, which in turn drives how the selection of the space and places, contexts, and research participants (co-researchers) who will share the most salient, wide-ranging, and rich data possible. Yin (2014) postulates that there are five key components to case study research design: the research question, the propositions, the unit(s) of analysis, the logic linking, and the criteria for making meaning (2014:29). As stated in chapter one, the research question that this thesis is constructed around is: how do CSOs facilitate/hinder Indigenous individuals, groups, and communities lived experience of the processes and practices of social citizenship? The knowledge constructed is also developed the arguments around four sub questions: (a) how does the history of the continued context of settler colonialism or shape contemporary Indigenous and Settler social citizenship processes and practices; (b) how does this context shape the places and spaces where interactions and relationships occur between CSOs and Indigenous and Settler individuals, groups, and communities; (c) what are the differences in the CSOs rhetoric and action and how are these differences perceived; and, (d) how does indigeneity and notions of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency via gender, race or ethnicity, and colonization intersect in these lived experiences of the processes and practices of social citizenship?

Henderson (2007) demonstrates how comparative case study research allows for the integration of “historical and contemporary” and “the aggregated and individual” (p.12) and all the necessary components to explore the above mentioned research questions and sub-questions. Yin (1994; 2014) states that a case study is an empirical inquiry that deals with a phenomenon in real life context, relies on multiple data sources and prior theoretical propositions. Yin further argues that case study inquiry also benefits from prior development of theoretical prepositions to guide data collection and analysis (p.17). Kaarbo and Beasley (1999) further refine the definition of comparative case study design and state that this needs to be done “through an empirical examination of a real-world phenomenon within its naturally occurring context, without directly manipulating either the phenomenon or the
context” (p.372). According to Yin (2014), if the main research question is a “how” question, which mine is, then the study is explanatory. If there is little available literature on the cases as is the situation here, the study becomes more explorative in nature and Yin further states that it is necessary to be explicit especially as to “what is to be explored, the purpose of the exploration and the criteria by which the exploration will be judged successful” (p.39). George and Bennett (2004) argue that case study design “is thus a well-defined aspect of a historical episode, rather than a historical event itself” (p.18), making it a suitable approach for exploring the processes and practices of social citizenship construction. The intention, as George and Bennett argue, is to accumulate data that lends toward ‘progressive generalizations’ about the lived experience of social citizenship. This type of design also allowed for high levels of conceptual validity and followed heuristic approaches in moving my initial deductive theorizing to potential inductively refining or developing new theories, to explore causal mechanism and intervening variables, and to accommodate for complex causal relationships (ibid: 20-22).

It is primarily for these reasons, after exploring the methodological literature that I base my research design on Smith (2012), Kovach (2009) Wilson (2008), Clark (2012), Fleras & Maaka, (2010), and Hunt, (2013). Thus, I employ a comparative case study design to explore the research question in Pacific Northwest of Canada at two sites in the province of British Columbia and the territory of the Yukon. Utilizing this methodological approach and case study design permits an exploration of the similarities and differences at the macro level of the influences of the Canadian context in practice, the action or agency at each site’s micro level and in the intersections at the meso level. By utilizing an indigeneity grounded analysis I can explore to what level these CSO research sites and their policies are informed by and legitimize indigenous difference, indigenous rights, indigenous belonging, indigenous self-determination, and indigenous spirituality. The intention is that the approach and findings could be compared or contrasted to other contexts and countries with similar colonial or imperial histories and/or countries with Indigenous populations that are also member of the British Commonwealth. Therefore, my methodological choices reflect the importance of the political, historical, and social contexts in which the categories of citizenship are made meaningful (Smith, 2012). This also aligns me with critical theory, un/decolonizing, intersectionality, and indigeneity principles which led me to using historical process-tracing to explore the context (Ward, 2014; Viswewaran, 2010, 1994; Tyler, 2013; Smith, 2012; Wolfe, 1999). Doing so allows the thematic analysis to tease out participants’ voices, their lived experience of social citizenship and perceptions privilege and abjection enables me to
place the processes and practices of social citizenship within the broader context of Canada as an ongoing settler-colonial state.

4.4 Research Story (how): Purposive & Relational Case Selection, Data Collection & Analysis

Preparation is the key to success. In Western academia preparation of research includes the development of a literature review, a research design, and an ethical review before one does the ‘how’, the methods of the research. As the research explores the interactions of Settlers and Indigenous peoples at specific sites of interaction, I also prepare in accordance with Indigenous methodology, participating in ceremony, learning place-based community or Nation protocols, and (adhering to them when) visiting community. It is also clear that throughout this ‘how’ process the role of reciprocity came at the beginning not at the completion of my research as all research participants, organizational or individual, articulated the need to know up front my purpose, aim, motivation, and how this research would give back to them, the organization and/or community.

The research focuses on how social citizenship theory can be utilized to explore the interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in civil society whether it be individuals, groups, or organizations through citizen acts in abject spaces. My skills, knowledge, and experiences are combined within the limited scope of a PhD thesis that necessitates an approach that focuses on one of these avenues. Accordingly, I determine that the most fitting is an exploration within civil society on one dimension of citizenship, the social. To further explore how research participants’ stories of the lived experience of social citizenship intersect through the relational aspects of Indigenous epistemologies within the space that CSO policies and praxis create. I also utilize secondary data sources such as documents, national, provincial, and territorial census materials, legislation, political narratives, reports, blogs, websites, social media that were both organizational and community based. Field notes, recordings and summary sheets are used to note recurring themes, environment and context, and my reactions and thoughts. Both primary and secondary data is used and thematically analyzed; the next section lays out the how of this research study.

4.4.1 Research Story (how): Case Selection

The case selection is also ‘relational’, I am an adopted member of the community of Tl’ésqóx and co-lead of Write to Read BC. My mother was the Executive Director of the Cariboo Chilcotin Child Development Centre Association, now retired, and she acted as my initial point of contact for the centre in the Yukon. From “an Indigenous perspective the relational is viewed as an aspect of methodology whereas within western constructs the
relational is viewed as a bias, and thus outside methodology” (Kovach, 2010: 42). The relational aspect is what got me access to these sites, as trust was already built or was relational (as the daughter of a well-known professional), and this ‘relational accountability’ (Wilson, 2008) is as stated earlier in this chapter core to a multi-epistemic methodology that privileges both Settler and Indigenous ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. Relational accountability has multiple benefits, and in this research this approach aids in access to research sites, aids in engendering trustworthiness, and aids in facilitating participation. To address potential or perceived bias in this approach I maintain detailed records, report results honestly, clearly state the research aim and limitations, and indigenized processes for checking validity.

To explore the research question, sub questions and purpose, I focus on interactions of CSOs, primarily composed of settler professionals delivering social service and advocacy, and Indigenous individuals, groups or communities who receive said services and advocacy through exploring the lived experience of social citizenship in this context. The cases are defined and bounded over ten years as (a) British Columbia: Settler and Indigenous individuals who were involved in Rotary’s literacy project Write to Read BC with the Tšilhqot’in Nation (Tl’ésqóx and Tl’étinqóx); and (b) Yukon: Settler and Indigenous individuals who were involved in CDC of Yukon’s programmes at either site (Whitehorse or Kwanlin Dün First Nations). Neither of these CSO were previously studied with regard to how their social service or advocacy facilitates or hinders the lived experience of social citizenship in these contexts or with these research participants.

This comparative case study therefore employs purposively selected civil society organizations (CSOs) that work with or on behalf of Indigenous individuals, groups, or communities. CSOs are selected relationally and through a dissimilar design with variation on the dependent variable (lived experience of social citizenship). This case selection also allows for the exploration of participants’ constructions of how their lived experiences relate to the larger or collective political landscape and the ways they impact agency providing insight within, across, and beyond the cases of citizen action rooted in these places and spaces. It also allows me to explore specific ways social citizenship practices and processes are perceived as enacted, embodied, and emplaced or not.

The journey of arriving at deciding on these two cases begins with multiple discussions with my supervisors of possible case selection highlighting the need for four cases within Canada in a different province or territory. The focus was to be specifically on CSOs and the Indigenous individuals, groups, and communities they work with. Each case in
the study was to have a variation on dependent variable, the lived experience of social citizenship using the four types of legal citizenship categories in Canada: Canadian (i.e., Settler), First Nation, Inuit, and Metis. This research uses a dissimilar design to explore CSOs who work with Indigenous individuals, groups, and communities in the spectrum of social action of service delivery and advocacy. As stated in the introduction, and in alignment with un/decolonizing, intersectionality, and indigeneity principles and approaches, awareness of my privileged position within Canadian society as both an academic and a citizen of mixed heritage, and reflexivity in my challenges and contestations in re-problematizing Canada as a continual settler colonial state are key. Therefore, using primary knowledge of the purposively selected cases using my networks and established connections, I was able to secure gatekeepers for the first three potential cases and one of my supervisors made a connection for me for the fourth identified case; the third group was an informal Metis women’s group in what is now called Alberta and the fourth was an Inuit youth group in Nunavut. As Kovach (2009) points out, the relational and holistic nature of this research meant I had to be flexible and adaptable to life, to the unexpected, and be willing to shift and walk another path with my research. Thus, circumstances out of my control led to the third case being terminated part way through due to a massive forest fire in 2016 that resulted in the loss of the CSO’s facilities. It was devastating story of who we are, what the lived experience of social citizenship can be, of what life is like on the ground in rural and remote communities of North America. I decided not to restart a third case and not pursue the fourth case study. I chose instead to focus on the two potential sites of interaction between Settler and Indigenous (i.e., First Nations) peoples, how these highlight roles and agency in the research participants’ lived experience of social citizenship. I thus made a strategic concession to reduce the scope of my doctoral research, rebound my research to the geographic region of the Pacific Northwest and the two case studies (British Columbia and Yukon).

These two cases are still selected on different values of the lived experience of social citizenship in the context of CSO social service delivery and advocacy as the BC case is a specific Indigenous service and the Yukon the services are open to all (both Settler and Indigenous). The decision is partially made for temporal and financial considerations. Also, 

---

9 A few of the women I connected were invited to participated and their lived experiences were woven into parallel research as part of an interdisciplinary multi province team exploring autism and perceptions of autism services in rural and remote British Columbia and Alberta – see Young, Nicholas, Chamberlain, Suapa, and Bailey (2019).
an in-depth literature review of the geographic region of the Pacific Northwest highlights the following: more than half of all Indigenous nations are geographically west of the Rocky Mountains, historically there is a different political and colonial relationship to the Crown than in the rest of Canada, and interactions are governed by a variety of legislation and legal precedents. The reduced scope of my thesis leaves open the opportunity to revisit the unfinished parts of my original research proposal, and I have been asked to return to the third site and complete the research with the CSO and community once they have rebuilt. By selecting only these two cases, I must however reflexively acknowledge, and report all biases such purposive selection creates and how it has affected my ability to make causal inferences through thematic process-tracing of the research participants’ lived experience of social citizenship in each case and then comparatively.

Thus, case selection is purposive and relational. It is based on a variation of the lived experience of social citizenship at the meso level (province vs. territory), the status level (status under the Indian Act vs Land Settlement Agreement), geographically (located in the Pacific Northwest), the CSO service delivery level (either had a specific Indigenous program or provided services to all citizens in the geographic area including within an Indigenous community or Nation) and at the epistemological and ontological foundation level of citizenship (Settler and Tšilhqot’in, Kwanlin Dün or urban Indigenous). This type of purposive sampling also enables me to adhere to funding requirements and restrictions set in collaboration, a criterion of validity, with Tl’ésqóx in the initial funding agreement that ultimately makes this dissertation possible, with a joint redrafting and updating of the community’s comprehensive plan that utilized a similar methodology in 2017-2018 (legal name used on application: Toosey Indian Band). The collaborative and funding requirements are: the research must be done in Canada; one of the ‘cases’ must be Write to Read BC and must include Tl’ésqóx (Toosey) as one of the sites; and include participation of Indigenous peoples within Canada. Selection is also relational as it is a key aspect in Indigenous methodologies and particularly relevant as there is a “need to have the relationship in place to offset the mistrust of research within Indigenous communities” (Kovach, 2009:126). It is about being a trustworthy researcher who understands that the research processes and practices be done in accordance with Indigenous epistemologies and be reciprocal in nature (ibid).

I also sought and received permission from the leadership in each of the Indigenous communities and from leadership of each CSO to use the collective information that is shared. Continually throughout the research process, acknowledging my privileged role, I
seek guidance and consent from all research participants, Settler and Indigenous alike, to use their stories in the ways presented here. This is an example of relational validity and relational accountability discussed earlier and aligns with western notions of peer review and member checking. This includes sending raw transcripts of the conversations, fieldwork and observational summaries, the summaries of the sharing circle, and going back to each community to present my initial findings for comment, criticism, and revision. Knowledge sharing and internal validation of data construction is be done through follow up sessions using presentations with sharing circles (Ritchie, et al, 2014; Kovach, 2009). Due to the start in 2020 of covid-19 pandemic, I am unable to hold the planned visits and feasts in each Nation and with each CSO before submission. Therefore, three Tsilhqot’in Matriarchs, Leaders and Knowledge Keepers, two Indigenous Matriarchs, Leaders, and Knowledge Keepers of what is now called the Yukon, and two participants from each case’s CSO reviewed the final draft of the dissertation at the same time as my supervisors prior to submission. Adapting my process in this way still ensures the practice of a final validity check through relational accountability, member checking, and peer debriefing. It is also in accordance with methodology, research design, and ways of the intersecting research communities. I have sought consent to use the knowledge and data beyond this dissertation, however, I will go back to ensure that anything that is done beyond this specific doctoral research has the ongoing collective consent of the research participants at each instance. It is about the principle of respect that is foundational in Indigenous methodology but often missing, or perceived to be, due to epistemological differences in how knowledge is seen as individualistic or collective, in more settler-centric research previously done on Indigenous people. This principle also enhances the reliability of the data and credibility in reaching the aim of centring marginalized or abject voices.

Therefore, for the reasons stated above, I justify my case selection as it is done in accordance with both Settler and Indigenous epistemologies through relational and purposive selection, done in consultation with my supervisors, met my grant funding requirements, and my aim of centring marginalized or abject voices to explore the lived experience of social citizenship. Yin (2014) clearly states that case study inquiry design is an appropriate choice for this type of research aim. Situating the research within the Pacific Northwest Canada also fulfills the requirements of a PhD in Canadian Studies. The context of the relational and purposively selected cases also allows for an exploration of the variation of citizenship created by the legal definitions of the macro level dual governing legislation discussed.
previously, as well as the 30-year Land Settlement Agreement and the Tšilhqot’în v. British Columbia case.

4.4.2 Research Story (how) – Purposive & Relational Praxis

A qualitative methods comparative case study allows for a wide range of evidence. The design is multi-level and uses mix-qualitative methods to describe the macro level context of Canada as a continual settler colonial state and to explore the meso and micro levels of the interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in the interactions between both CSOs and Settler and Indigenous individuals, groups, and communities in the lived experience of social citizenship.

To remain relational and reflexive, to ensure self-care while continually un/decolonizing my thoughts and actions, I continually seek guidance from Elders (both Indigenous and Settler), Knowledge Keepers, my family, mentors and record my thoughts, questions, and ongoing ethical dilemmas of doing this type of research as a privileged mixed raced researcher. It enables me to be reflective and insightful of how my perspectives and motivations, both personal and academic, guides how my inquiry shifts and evolves. These recordings are used as a tool for making meaning and evidence of the process. These choices of validity procedures with reflexivity being one, are as Creswell and Miller (2000) contend, based on the research lens and my shifting and evolving perspective. Embedding “uncomfortable reflexivity” as highlighted earlier into the research design and into the ‘how’ of the research story ensures accountability to Indigenous struggles in the pursuit of self-representation and self-determination (Viswewaran, 1994) while actively pursuing the research purpose and aim.

In the first case, I either know or met the individuals I interviewed; I act as my own gatekeeper utilizing existing relationships thus engendering a clear sense of ‘relational accountability’ (Wilson 2008; Kovach 2010) as ‘researcher-in-relation’ thus all research participants are known to me. As secured funding with Tl’ésqóx and my research became a part of the community’s comprehensive planning process via community engagement meetings and knowledge sharing circles. Knowledge sharing circles are also a part of the cultural sharing processes and practices at Tl’etinqóx and are used in the work with the Write to Read BC team. Each community provides foundational knowledge of how the laws, protocols, and process are enacted, embodied, and emplaced. Knowledge sharing circles help me as an adopted midugh to situate the lived experiences with Write to Read BC within the larger context of continued settler colonialism and the specific socio-historic context of each space and place. Taking part in these processes and practices are a part of my relational
responsibilities and mean I have a relational accountability to treat research as ceremony, as a sacred relationship to place (the land), to space (being in relation), and to the ways of being (laws and protocols). Reframing research as ceremony, Wilson (2008) argues, allows us to see our methods, as “simply the building of more relations” (p.79) which in the first case aligns with the Tšilhqot’in Dechen Ts’edilhtan (the “laws of our relations”). The knowledge sharing circles thus also provide the opportunity to invite participants in each space and place to further be a part of my research journey through the interview process. By adhering to community and nations protocols, the laws of our relations, enables me to invite all who are ‘in relations’ in the communities directly involved to participate as their capacity, ability/availability, and willingness to share knowledge with a midugh dictates.

In the second case, I was introduced to the Executive Director of the Yukon Child Development (YCDC) Centre by my mother. Once the initial contact was made, I began to forge a relationship with the Executive Director on my own over several months as we built trust with each other and an understanding of the purpose, aim, and motivations of my doctoral research. Connection to the Indigenous community of Kwanlin Dün is initially facilitated through gatekeepers from YCDC in in adherence with organizational policy and community protocols; this also allows for ‘relational accountability’ to be built via a gatekeeper known to the community and potential research participants.

As I am an outsider in the Yukon, I also sought advice from my mentors in BC, particularly Tšilhqot’in Knowledge Keepers and Elders on how to proceed in the most culturally appropriate way when visiting another Indigenous community where I am unknown. I am continually reminded that protocols, although connected and rooted in space and place, are in essence about respect. Be respectful. I also keep the three teaching from the 28th Lieutenant Governor Steven L. Point (Sto:lo) forefront of mind when doing relational work and did so throughout this research journey. These three teachings are: in a good way walk in the direction of your intention; you have two eyes, two ears, and one mouth thus observe and listen twice as much as you speak; and, when in doubt, be like the river and go with the flow. In addition, the Elders and Knowledge Keepers of the Tšilhqot’in advised I give a gift of respect and reciprocity as I am adopted into Tl’ésqóx, thus I picked traditional medicine, sage, from the territory to give. Also, to speak the truth in Tšilhqot’in to speak the truth is: ‘tsi’idanes jid yalhtig-sigh dan nus jeed yath tick’; this truth telling is further ground in the exchange of sacred medicines, of something from the land. It is also advised that when I go to another territory, I should host a feast, introduce myself, my research, and then give a gift.
I will do my best to convey with words what hosting a feast with the Child Development Centre and Dusk’a was like as this was done with both the YCDC staff and in the community. As I am an outsider, I am so grateful for YCDC in helping me arrange for the food both in Whitehorse and to facilitate the connection with the cooks at Dusk’a in Kwanlin Dün. For both the information and sharing circle sessions, the YCDC provided childcare services to families with children so that they too could attend the sessions and sharing circles (see below).

I hosted a luncheon at the YCDC and hosted a dinner at Dusk’a. A plain language blurb about my research was provided to the YCDC to be sent out with an initiation to staff, board of directors, and parents who accessed services at both or either site. Along with the blurb was an invitation to learn more at an information session, share a meal, and participate in a sharing circle. Sharing food is important as food connects us to the land, to language, to culture and feasting is a part of Athabascan culture, part of the potlatching, and sharing a meal is an important protocol of many social processes and practices. At each feast, I offered each person who came a gift. If people were not comfortable to take the gift, I did not expect them too. As Kovach states, “protocols may differ according to tribal group…normally [protocol] require food, and there is a meditative acknowledgement to all of those who are in the circle, including ancestors that sit with us” (2009:124) This is fundamentally why I shared food and my own story providing a brief relational account of who I am and the purpose, aim, and motivations of my research, to honour the epistemology and ontology of the space and place I was in. “In situations where the topic is sensitive, a pre-research discussion could be helpful to prepare research participants, it is also a good opportunity to review consent forms” (Kovach, 2010; 46). Therefore, I asked to hold a feast and information sessions to introduce myself, as I am a stranger, and to ensure cultural safety of potential participants I want to ensure my purpose, aim, and motivations and relational connections are as transparent as possible, to build and maintain good research relationships, and foster trust. By adhering to these social process and practices, and specific place-based protocols, my hope was that those present may witness and be able to hold me relationally accountable by building a tentative trust based on adherence to principles of respect and honesty. It also centres Indigenous ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing and puts into practices the aim of the research through this power sharing process centring marginalized or abject voices in a respectful way that is validated via these places based social processes, practices, and protocols.
The Indigenous method of sharing circle is also used as part of the data collection process “as a method of gathering group knowledges…is based upon cultural tradition and has been adapted to contemporary settings as research” (Kovach 2009). Sharing circles are often part of ceremony and are used in many of social processes and practices of Tl’ésqóx and Tl’étnqóx that I participate in, including community and Nation planning and cultural gatherings. A sharing circle is based on the principle equality through power sharing and there is no hierarchy, and everyone has the opportunity to share what they like, as much or as little or even to stay silent or pass. In a sharing circle power and agency is with the research participant. As Lavallée insists, “sharing circles are used to capture people’s experiences [and] how they differ from focus groups is the sacred meaning they have in many Indigenous [sic] cultures and in the growth and transformation bases for the participants” (2009: 28). As Kovach (2009) reminds us, sharing circles are more than focus groups, more than talking and extracting information, they are a ceremonial and sacred space that also normally require food, use protocols that are placed based, and acknowledge all including ancestors in the circle in a method to engender a story directed by the research participants. Sharing circles use a conversation method within a circle as do the informal conversational interview method and these types of reflexive presentation are “a dialogic approach to gathering knowledge that is built upon Indigenous relational traditions… [and] prompt conversation where participant and research co-create knowledge” (Kovach 2010: p.44). Dialogue is, Kovach argues, an effective way to co-create knowledge in a relational context (ibid: 45). This form of yarning, as Bessarab and Ng’andu (2010) call it, helps me build trust and reciprocity within the dialogue that is semi-structured but flexible enough so research participants could share their own stories on their own terms. It is, as Pillow (2004) states, a specific method that is argued by Weber-Pillwax to be about the “creation of shared meaning through conversation” (1999:33).

Each sharing circle in both cases began and closed with a blessing to offer gratitude for the sharing with each other experiences and learning from one another. For example, following the meal at Kwanlin Dün, we sat in a circle, an attending Elder opened the circle with a blessing, and everyone shared a bit about who we are, how we are connected to the CSO, and what they’d like to see come of this research opportunity or any questions, concerns, or anything else. Everyone was given as much or as little time as they needed; in one sharing circle in the first case an individual introduced themselves and then sat, silent for a time, before saying “just do it in a good way”. After, anyone who is interested in participating further in the research was able to schedule a time to share their stories with me.
in relations to my research question individually, or as families, in an informal conversational interview. Surprisingly almost all who attended both feasts with information sessions and sharing circles hosted by the YCDC agreed and participated in the research. I owe a debt of gratitude to the staff at the YCDC and the Kwanlin Dün Headstart Centre for facilitating this amazing experience. It should also be noted that I also shared food with my BC research participants but on a one-to-one basis as they were all known to me, and I also gave each a small gift of sage. In the BC context, smaller sharing circles of three to four participants were done and I arranged food or snacks and childcare where needed. These were done either in my home, within a community hall after hours, out on the land, or following an organizational assembly in a conference space.

Interviews are semi-structured, flexible, interactive, exploratory, generative (Ritchie, Lewis, McNaughton Nicholls & Ormston, 2014) and culturally responsive. The sharing circles are also culturally responsive (Smith, 2012) and allow me to observe and construct data regarding the dynamic between Settler and Indigenous citizens. It is through these semi-structured conversational interviews that are flexible and informal, sharing circles, and community, organization, and participant observations that I collected my primary data. As it is a conversation, and as the researcher, I share my own story and experience. Not every semi-structured question is asked specifically as participants often answered multiple questions (without them having to be asked) as the conversation progressed (see Appendix A). To ensure that participants share only what they want, as stated above, the raw transcripts are sent to participants to be approved, revised, and edited. Again, it is worth stating that this type of conversation method is inherently relational and therefore congruent with an Indigenous methodology.

As stated above in the sharing circles and congruent with Indigenous epistemology, relational accountability, and respect for local protocols at each interview a small gift of sage (women’s medicine) wrapped in one of the 4 colours of the medicine wheel are given. This is done “to show acknowledgement of the relationship and respect for the insight being offered” (Kovach 2010; 44). I express not only my purpose, aim, and motivations but also a commitment that the research will be used purposefully. I acknowledge that the relationship between researcher and research participants was one of responsibility with core Indigenous research values, as articulated by Kovach (2010; 2009), Wilson (2008), Smith (1999), of respect, relevancy, reciprocity, responsibility, and accountability.
4.4.3 Research Story (how) – Analyzing the data

Using multiple data sources, I am able to explore the inferences that can be made about the role of civil society organization in the lived experience of social citizenship with marginalized Indigenous individuals, groups, and communities in abject space through interpretative process-tracing and thematic analysis techniques. I follow a heuristic logic of interpretation through conversations with research participants, observation, and thematic analysis of all conversations in each case using a process tracing technique with across case and within case comparison. By focusing on a single dimension of citizenship both similarities and dissimilarities in the social citizenship processes and practices are evaluated. Whose knowledge counts in citizenship processes and practices and how is also explored. Interactions and intersects of notions of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in the dynamics of class, race, gender, and colonization regarding the roles Settler and Indigenous citizens play when civil society organizations are involved in abject spaces with marginalized citizens is thematically analyzed.

This process allows for the construction of arguments around my main research question. Using the above-mentioned sub-questions, I explore if social citizenship processes and practices are static, a part of the historical context, or dynamic, evolving and changing over time. The research design allows also for an exploration of the different elements of social citizenship found within civil society. Using the research question and sub-questions, I qualitatively assess the impacts, both positive and negative, of the relationships and interactions between CSOs and research participants’ lived experience social citizenship. In doing so I can fill a gap in the literature on civil society as the space where social action and movements occur as Choudry and Kapoor (2010) argue. These authors argue that these sites of political processes and knowledge construction are often ignored by academia. As such the following research aim is to centre marginalized and abject voices to investigate what these potential sites of interaction tell us about the perception and reality of the roles and agency in the lived experience of social citizenship. The analysis also locates modes of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in particular locations or places and spaces. This approach, a mixed-qualitative methodology and case study design, allows me to do this combination of within case analysis and cross-case comparison on the dependent variable. Sharing circles enrich the analysis via insight garnered from collective meaning making and peer checking that enables further insights to be integrated and implications to be refined all through practices and processes of relational accountability this space enables.
Informed consent was sought and obtained from each of the participants, organizations, and communities in writing or verbally throughout the research process. It is done each time a participant is involved in the research to ensure cultural responsiveness and participant protection and avoiding undue intrusion, ensuring confidentiality, enabling participation, and protecting myself from any adverse consequences.

Spencer, Ritchie, Ormston, O’Connor and Barnard (2014) argue that analysis is an inherent and ongoing processes of creativity and systematic diligent detection. Mills (2000) elegantly points out it is our imagination that enables us “to understand the larger historical scene in terms of its meaning for the inner life… of individuals” (p.5) and to “grasp history and biography and the relations between the two in society” (p.6). Once data is collected, the ‘formal analyses included five stages each inclusive of multiple analytical decisions: data familiarization and reduction, descriptive analysis, coding the “what and why”, explanation, and verification. It is always about acknowledging what knowledge will be privileged in this mutli epistemic study. Emersion with the data is key, as it assists in avoiding the critic that this type of analysis is merely descriptive. For all 41 interviews, I digitally recorded the conversations with research participants to ensure their voice came through as genuinely as possible. I also decided to transcribe all interviews myself as a “means of protecting the words” (Kovach, 2009:128) they have shared. It was a powerful process as it allows me to relive the conversations and hear the stories again. The relevant data at the macro level is bound from 1867 to present, and data constructed at the micro and meso levels were bounded to within 10 years of the data collection phase (2009-2019). This enables me to include ongoing observations and interactions via validity checks that adhere to both Western and Indigenous methodological standards. Analysis is done using process-tracing, a technique George and Bennett (2004) define as within case analysis that focuses on the causal path in a single case. By establishing the relevant variables for each case this congruence procedure allows for the connection of what I observe to what I have theorized and then if consistent inferred possible causal relationships (ibid:179). I use condensed pieces of the stories of my participants to capture as much of their voices as possible and then to analytically access parts of the process that are less explicit. Therefore, I use a combination of process tracing, explanatory, interpretative and thematic analysis. This ongoing process from Yin (2014) outlines above informs my analysis process throughout the dissertation.

An assumption in qualitative research is that information or data provided by participants or sites is accurate and honest, relevant and with ownership, and that it is done with consent and confidence. To limit bias, as stated above, I hosted knowledge sharing
events to share my initial analysis and allow for review, revisions, and reiterations both individually and in group settings. Therefore, analysis employs an explanation-building strategy where “the case study evidence is examined, theoretical positions are revised, and the evidence is examined once again from a new perspective,” (Yin, 1994: 111).

4.5 The next chapter…

The re-problematizing of the context of continual settler colonialism in Canada fosters the exploration of how CSOs facilitate or hinder the lived experience of social citizenship with Indigenous individuals, groups or communities through a comparative case study design that is multi-leveled, bounded and uses multi epistemological grounded qualitative methods to thematically analysis multiple data sources from a variety of disciplines through interpretative and process tracing techniques. Reflexivity and knowledge sharing are key to this exploration and allows me to remain true to my personal philosophy and ensure cultural responsiveness as a privileged Settler of mixed heritage researcher in this context. It also allows me to contribute by filling a gap in the literature of CSOs, adding to the discussion of citizenship in Canada through exploration of the variations in types of citizens in the Pacific Northwest in this context, demonstrating the need for analytically sound solutions that do not further impede or re-colonize the real-life challenges CSOs work towards addressing. Mixed—qualitative methods potentially can be used to explore other context or countries with colonial histories and Indigenous population to compare or contrast the findings. It is a way to look at the intersect between the larger political landscape(s), how participants construct their lived experience of social citizenship, and their agency through delving into modes of power in particular places and spaces. It enables the investigation of whose knowledge counts in the perceptions of how processes and practices of social citizenship are enacted, embodied, and emplaced. The next three empirical chapters provide the in case and across case analysis, interpretations, and comparisons.
Chapter Five: British Columbia & Tšilhqot’in Nation: Rotary’s Write to Read BC Project

This chapter is the presentation of the first case study of my research which involves the CSO Rotary International’s Write to Read BC project with the Tšilhqot’in Nation (Tl’ésqóx and Tl’etàtìnqóx) in the Cariboo Chilcotin region of British Columbia. It explores the potential for CSOs to create a ‘space between’ for political agency or what Young (2000) called democracy in action. My aim is to focus attention on whose knowledge counts to explore participants’ perceptions and possible counter narratives of social citizenship. In doing so the aim is to centre Indigenous voices, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing in the exploration of the CSO as both a site of research on social citizenship and as a site of social citizenship itself. A thematic analysis of the interviews and sharing circles, combined with observational data, highlights several salient inductive themes that arise from the participants’ narratives of their own lived experience of social citizenship processes and practices at these sites of interaction. These themes are then grouped into three overarching themes for discussion and exploration utilizing indigeneity principles in an intersectional-based approach. This is useful as it allows for an illustration of points of commonality between and among citizen groups while allowing for discernible differences, confounding points, and counter narratives.

To determine the potential for Rotary International via Write to Read BC to create a ‘space between’, the place of social action, it is explored as both a site of research on social citizenship and a site of social citizenship. First, I will explore whose knowledge counts in these places of social actions, the problematized space between, in the interactions of Indigenous and Settler citizens. Whose knowledge counts is explored through both lens using three avenues of analysis: what the CSO set out to do in their own words in relations to social citizenship, what participants perception of this is, and my own interpretation of both to consider whether the CSO Rotary International via Write to Read BC is effective in honouring indigenous difference in creating spaces and places for participation, partnership, and power sharing. By considering the why, what, and how of the CSO, Rotary International’s Write to Read BC project the analysis will explore the explicit and implicit impacts these organization practices and processes have on social citizenship as well as participants reactions to them. As a space and place to explore the relationship between the organizational rhetoric, how it thinks about, and its social actions or praxis, the doing of, social citizenship. As well it is a space and place to explore enacting social citizenship through an intersectional indigeneity lens of the lived, practiced, and relational aspects of
hegemonic and counter-hegemonic perspectives. Centring Indigenous voices in these social actions provides a potential space for redressing or contesting abjection through highlighting possible counter narratives. These opportunities for power sharing Fleras & Maaka (2010) argue require participation and partnerships that honour *indigenous difference*. By viewing the CSO as both a site of research on social citizenship and a site of social citizenship also allows me to explore if this CSO and this project create a space between, a place where all social actors have a voice in determining whose knowledge counts and how.

This discussion of the CSO, Rotary International’s Write to Read BC project processes and practices, these specific activities of social citizenship that the CSO fosters (or not) also creates the opportunity to explore participants’ perceptions of social citizenship. These perceptions of the dimensions of social citizenship are explored in relation to the social actions and interactions produced through Write to Read BC project activities with each community. These perceptions are also nested within the historical, social, and political landscapes or conditions of these citizens’ lived experiences of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency are situated. Combined the presented historical conditions, brief CSO description, and the description of the Supreme Court Case presented in chapter two situate the socio-political empirical evidence and participants’ perceptions found within the lived experiences. Within these nested contexts are the social citizenship processes and practices at the sites of interactions between Settler and Indigenous citizens facilitated by Write to Read BC. Finally, I will offer a few case specific ideas of what the CSO Rotary International in general and Write to Read BC more specifically could do differently.

In this case, the coproducers of this knowledge are the 24 individuals who were interviewed or participated in a sharing circle. Of these 24 individuals: nine are Indigenous participants and fifteen are Settler, seven of whom are first generation immigrant Settlers. Eleven of the participants are female, eleven are male, and two self-identify as “two-spirited” or “gay” males. The one youth is the only exception as all the others have or had (four are retired) a professional designation or role in their respective communities. All participants were given the opportunity for anonymity; all participants chose to and gave me permission to use their first names. Please see Appendix B for more participant information.

**5.1 Rotary International and Write to Read BC – Revisited**

The academic literature on Rotary International (RI) is limited, and those relevant to this research were narrowed down to a handful of peer reviewed articles (all on polio eradication), five doctoral dissertations electronically available, and four other graduate theses or projects either directly on the organization or one of its programs/projects, and only
one of these mentions Write to Read BC\textsuperscript{10}. This limited amount of publicly or electronically available academic research on Rotary has been noted by other scholars (Charles, 1987). It also appears that the organization has been very good at controlling its message and public image, and this has primarily been done through its own magazine, Rotary, (formally The Rotarian), and via its online presence (www.rotary.org). Rotary has its own archives that house tens of thousands of photos, recordings, publications, and artifacts; however, access to materials is often restricted due to the condition of the materials or restrictions set by donors. Thus, the following critical account of the organization comes via this limited literature, organizational documents, and online sources, as well as personal communications with members and my own experience as a Rotarian since 2008. I do acknowledge and recognize my own bias as a member of this organization and as one of the co-leaders of Write to Read BC. However, as discussed in chapter four, this relational positioning provides me with access, insider knowledge, and the ability to be relationally responsive through my methodological choices to my participants, in particular the Indigenous participants, as I am already known and trusted. As Lincoln and Guba argue “objectivity is a chimera” (2000: 181), and I agree that knowing cannot be separated from the knower. It’s less about validity through triangulation but instead through crystallization, “a deepened, complex, thoroughly partial understanding of the topic” (ibid). As a result, I have paid close attention to voice, both my own as researcher and the participants’ voices, to being reflexive in my critiques, and how I textually represent both in my attempt to un-colonize my presentation of the material while acknowledging my own settler privilege. Keeping notions of crystallization in the forefront of mind through voice, reflexivity, and textual representation the following is a brief account of the organization and project as they are the site of interaction under investigation and in the next section under analysis.

By the 1930s, Rotary became a men’s civic club leveraging small-town-know-how first nationally, and then internationally, asserting its own protocols of a new philanthropic and capitalist vision for business and social contacts (De Grazia, 2005). Clubs were made up of mostly white wealthy male, either businessmen or professionals, and membership denoted social prestige within a community. As RI spread across North America and Britain it is heavily criticized as being clubs of businessmen who only talk never taking action (Forward, 109)

George Bernard Shaw is claimed to have said, “Where is Rotary going? It is going to lunch” (ibid). Some of the harshest criticisms at this time come from within as reported in The Rotarian (RGHF, 2017); there were concerns that Rotary had moved from being a club that worked for the community in which it was based to becoming a ‘self-help’ organization. After World War II, Charles (1987) research demonstrates that clubs began to refer to themselves as volunteer charitable agencies or volunteer-based civil society organizations.

Globalization, bolstering of volunteerism, and the inclusion of women leads to a revival of Rotary internationally (De Grazia, 2005). However, this revival is not easy as this paternalistic organization is reticent to change despite efforts of Rotarians from the 1950s onward to lobby for the inclusion of women into Rotary (Rotary International, 2017). In 1978, The Rotary Club of Duarte, California, USA, admits women as members in violation of the Rotary International Constitution. Because of this violation the club's membership in Rotary International is terminated (ibid). As a result, the club files a lawsuit in the state which eventually made it to the U.S. Supreme Court, which ruled in 1987 that Rotary clubs may not exclude women from membership on the basis of gender (McGovern, 1988). This shift in membership in the organization pushed from the inside and reinforced from the outside begins the ongoing journey of moving Rotary’s culture of exclusivity that discriminated based on sex to a more inclusive one based on diversity, equity, and inclusion. Finally, in 1989 Rotary International’s Council on Legislation voted to eliminate the gender bias requirement for membership, and women are welcomed into Rotary. In 2013 Anne L. Matthews is the first woman to serve as RI vice president; in 2017 Dean Rohrs (Settler), research participant, is only the fourth women to hold this position. In August of 2020, Rotary International announces the nomination of Jennifer Jones to the position of RI President in 2022-2023, she will be the first woman to hold this position. The now historic 1989 Council also establishes Service Above Self as the principal motto of Rotary, because it best conveys the philosophy of unselfish volunteer service.

In my own experience as a Rotarian and in more than a decade of dialogue with fellow Rotarians locally, nationally, and internationally, RI has many great qualities but there is also a clearly paternalistic and at times racist side to the organization that is only discussed very quietly and behind closed doors. I have heard from several women directly that they often felt unwelcomed in some clubs, that the humour and banter at some club meetings is
highly sexist and inappropriate.\textsuperscript{11} Perhaps Jennifer Jones’ recent nomination and the new diversity and equity policy and action plan will both be catalyst for much needed organizational change.

The organization is still very traditional, very ‘old school’, and clubs in North America are often stuck in doing things the way they always have, for example how and when the meetings are run to saying grace and singing the national anthem of where the club is located. The implication is that moving from exclusivity to inclusivity is a process and the organization is perhaps still working through the cultural shift, as it was a male-only organization for more than 80 years and it was predominately in North America a club for privileged white males. In rural and remote spaces, Wellburn (2012) and O’Connell (2010) argue the prevalence of these types of cultural norms that celebrate whiteness and sustain frontier narratives of the superiority of privileged Settlers helps to foster and ensure continued settler colonialism in Canada.

In 2016, following a RI Council on Legislation the organization has undergone a substantial public image campaign as concerns over stagnant membership numbers and relevance for younger generations are taken into consideration. In 2017, the CSO also launched a rebranding campaign, Rotary ~ People of Action, to promote the organization’s new vision\textsuperscript{12} and strategic direction. As well, the RI Board in 2019 articulated a commitment to continuing to evolve organizational culture from an exclusive businessmen’s club to a global service organization that advances diversity and inclusion. Diversity is said to be one of the organizations core values, and that the organization “celebrates the contributions of people of all backgrounds, regardless of their age, ethnicity, race, color, abilities, religion, socioeconomic status, culture, sex, sexual orientation, and gender identity”. This organizational effort to be more inclusive will take constant action, effort, and will require personal reflection and correction by Rotarians for clubs around the globe to represent their communities. However, creating this kind of culture of belonging, this shift from exclusion to inclusion begins with this organization wide effort to have difficult conversations and to educate to ensure the spaces being created are inclusive, diverse, equitable, and accessible. The caution will be that it can’t be tokenism, it has to be an intentional seeking of

\textsuperscript{11} I too have experienced this; as well as being ‘mansplained’ to on numerous occasions. At a Rotary event in Scotland for International Women’s Day an older male Rotarian, when asked if the then female RI vice president Jennifer Jones (see above) would ever be president, said, “oh she is a lovely lady, but she will never be President, she doesn’t know how to play by the old boys’ rules”.

\textsuperscript{12} Together, we see a world where people unite and take action to create lasting change — across the globe, in our communities, and in ourselves.
marginalized and abjectified community voices with integrity and authenticity. The strongest statement to date on the subject was made in February 2021 by Rotary International President Holger Knaack and demonstrates how senior leadership in the organization is intentionally trying to set the tone,

As we begin this work, Rotary’s leadership is united in stating that Rotary does not tolerate speech or behaviour that promotes bias, discrimination, prejudice, or hatred because of age, ethnicity, race, colour, abilities, religion, socioeconomic status, culture, sex, sexual orientation, or gender identity. We do not believe that this is a political stance and we do believe that we should openly discuss these issues within our organization… We know that this journey will take time and lead to challenging conversations, deep self-reflection, and new opportunities for discovery and growth. We must all feel empowered to speak out respectfully and hold ourselves and each other accountable when our actions do not reflect Rotary’s ideals. Look for more opportunities to be a part of this shared journey. We want participation, input, and ideas from our members all over the globe as we strive to show what’s possible when we uphold our commitment to diversity and respect for all.

The message that is being set appears to be clear that there is no longer any place within Rotary for racism, homophobia, transphobia, sexism, classism, or ageism. Time will tell what impact these newest changes and shifts will have on the apparent continued ingrained reticence to change, the continued bias, discrimination, prejudice, or hatred exhibited by some clubs and some members.

There are however two internal statistics that can be analysed that relate to membership that show that despite organizational shifts towards inclusion over the last 30 years things have moved quite slowly. In 2020, for example, women made up only 26 percent of the global membership and 33 percent of the membership in North America in Rotary International. The second example is Rotary membership that has been stagnant with no true growth in more than a decade. The membership has stayed globally at approximately 1.2 million with about 150,000 coming in and 150,000 leaving each year; this tells us Rotary is good at attraction, but the attrition rates also tell us that the organization at the club level is not keeping the value proposition of membership, including living up to the core value of diversity through including a true representation of the community.

These two examples could also be what Craig (2011) argues that Rotarians’ actions, how we do our service, does to not always match their stated values. Therefore, this could be
linked to the CSO not meeting the proposed value proposition, so members leave. However, Craig’s critical analysis of the organization on the one hand shows how volunteers in the international context describe their relationship with those they serve as static. As he argues, “the volunteer as the source of answers for the recipient”; or put another way the volunteer doing something ‘for’ or on ‘behalf of’, is perceived as othering, as being marginalizing. This type of ‘othering’ Craig perceives in the rhetoric of the Rotarian interviewees about international service and the perception of it is always harmless and always good in contrast to the perception of the local service. “This contrast shows a disconnect between the way volunteers describe those in need close to them an those far way” (ibid: 122). Again, raising the question of ‘how’ service is being done, or who is sharing power with whom, i.e., whose knowledge counts. On the other hand, Craig does acknowledge that the claim for Rotary structure, the way it does service in this case internationally, as fostering grassroots and participatory effort is valid. His research highlights how CSO social actions internationally are framed by “how we think about ourselves and others and how those perceptions influence the approach to our interactions with others can significantly change the approach to service” (ibid: 132).

These examples also speak to part of the reason I initially proposed doing a Write to Read BC project and this research with a rural and remote Indigenous community. I was frustrated with the Rotary International Project model that only looked at applying the avenues of service internationally. My frustration stemmed from seeing the same needs in my own backyard through my work with the Indigenous communities in my region. Had Rotary not provided the opportunity for my path to cross with other like-minded individuals and help create Write to Read BC, I am not sure if I would have remained as a member. Doing this project affords me the insight into the organization that allows me to see its potential, despite the continued ‘male, pale, and stale’ environment of its paternalistic foundations. The intentional act to include the marginalized voices ensures the social actions of the organization would no longer be perceived as using the ‘strategic other’ as Craig (2011) argues, thus enabling a closer alignment between expressed values and social action. So, time will also tell if these shifts in organizational culture are more than mere words and if they will truly move Rotary from exclusive to inclusive.

5.1.1 Write to Read BC

Building on the definition of literacy in chapter two, first the descriptive account of Write to Read BC will be expanded, and I will provide some further insights from my own
lived experience of the project to help further contextualize the participants’ lived experiences of the interactions at these sites.

Academic literature on Write to Read BC consist of a graduate project done by Community Champion Eve Clarke (2015) on the Gathering Place in Ditidaht First Nation, a library learning centre project done in partnership with the community. Clarke is non-Indigenous and was at the time of the project a schoolteacher in the remote community and her ethnographic project explores the community’s purpose for pursing a project with Write to Read BC. Clarke argues the community’s purpose was twofold: to increase language skills and to have access to a space with literacy resources within the community. Hare (2011) argues social relationships are where knowledge and language are taught but only if there is a place, a space for said social interactions. The Gathering Place in Ditidaht is thus seen as a space to integrate culture and new technologies to increase literacy. Clarke (2015) also demonstrates the Ditidaht’s twofold purpose and Write to Read BC aim are in alignment facilitated by its process of “working with” (p.44) and being a part of “all of the decision making” (p.55). The process of collaboratively establishing a library “working alongside” (ibid:58), working with, is argued to be key. Clarke in this graduate project does not however clearly state her methodology and data collection is focused on observing diagnostic reading and storytelling in the space of library. However, she does argue that “by simply creating a space for everyone to visit, the library now hosts Elder’s meetings, training workshops, distance education, as well as literacy activities on a weekly basis” (ibid: 55). Therefore, in describing the process of creating this space the research does show how the process itself fostered alignment between the overreaching community purpose and Write to Read BC’s aim, discussed next.

Write to Read engages external partners in literacy equity projects that incorporate Indigenous epistemologies and values to meet their community’s wishes and goals, builds relationships, and breaks down barriers created by the historical conditions previously mentioned. It is arguably an example of an intercultural micro-philanthropic project that embodies the notion of the “importance of building long-term relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous communities” (Timpson, 2008; p. 14). There is a societal need to therefore begin to build healthier relationships, to rebuild the trust, create opportunities for participation, partnership, and power sharing. A regaining of trust is required as it is the bedrock of democracy established through three complementary levels: as an individual trait, as a relationship, and as a cultural rule (OECD, 2013; S, 1999). In my experience with Write to Read BC trust is a key value, as are honesty, respect, and justice in
the shared pursuit of literacy equity. These values lead to the development and implementation of what I argue to be a collaborative intercultural model for partnership that is culturally responsive and inclusive. The proof is in the numbers for as of 2020, twenty library learning centres are established and fully installed with the help of 23 Rotary Clubs across BC; there are another ten more in process.

Again, I feel I must be reflexive and acknowledge my potential bias as a co-lead of this project (see previous section). My professional role as a literacy coordinator for the Cariboo Chilcotin region of province at the time of the initiation of this project gives me not only insider knowledge of the scope and breadth of the literacy inequities in the region, but in the Indigenous communities I work with, including Tl’ésqóx. This awareness of the lack of literacy resources beyond the city of Williams Lake in the more rural and remote parts of the region, combined with my connection to Rotary, gave me the impetus to act and utilize the larger network of literacy advocates my connections provide to plead my case. Initially the idea is to simply bring books to rural and remote communities. For example, in the two Tšilhqot’in communities under exploration in this case study, Tl’esqox and Tl’étinqóx were both visited by Steven (Sto:lo) in his role as Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia and Bob (Settler) who was acting as an aide to camp for Government House. I had the honour of organizing trips to five Indigenous communities within the Cariboo Chilcotin region of British Columbia in 2009. Both communities in this case are part of these visits and what is to become known as Write to Read BC. In both the communities in this case study, Tl’esqox and Tl’étinqóx, the initial meeting with the community is held with Bob (Settler) and myself. In both communities the meetings included elected leadership (Chief and Council), Elders, Knowledge Keepers, and fluent language speakers (many Elders do not speak or refuse to speak English and require a translator), Youth, staff, and a few community members at large. In both, community meetings were led by the community and began with ceremony, a blessing in the language and in the case of Tl’étinqóx a song. Next the team was welcomed by the Chief and everyone in the circle was asked to introduce themselves, Bob and I included. In each meeting, Bob (Settler) and I ask those present three questions: is there a need, can we help, and how? Tl’ésqóx articulates the need was literacy equity, particularly a need for literacy resources, and initial discussion were centred on setting up a bookshelf or two in a corner of the band office with a computer as little learning niche youth and community members could access. As we continue to meet with the community and build trust, participation increases of community members, other Rotarians, and sponsors as the project evolved. This leads to two things: a recognition of the lack of safe spaces and places
in the community, there simply is not enough infrastructure, and two, that the community wants a space and place for literacy. Tl’ésqóx didn’t trust yet that Write to Read BC could provide the need they articulated. To fully establish the tentative trust that was budding at this initial meeting it became key that our actions always match our words. Steven (Sto:lo) cautions us from the beginning also that in working with Indigenous communities to only promise what we could deliver. A few years later in Tl’étinqóx, the community this time articulates although there is a need for literacy equity, there is also a need for health literacy equity and there was an opportunity provided through a new health building that contained dental equipment. By this point, Write to Read BC is already partnered with University of British Columbia’s Dental School and had done dental missions in other communities. These missions were in part due to the broad definition of literacy and aim of working with participating Indigenous communities, Rotarians, Government House, and the volunteers of Write to Read BC on literacy and social services equality. In both cases the community lead the project from choosing all the books, furniture, and literacy resources, to determine how and to whom the dental services would be delivered. As each dental mission was over three to four days, the community hosted the Write to Read BC and their partner the University of British Columbia’s Dental School directly in the community. All who were hosted participated in cultural activities including sharing circles with community members, Elders, and Knowledge Keepers. By the third year of the dental mission, Tl’étinqóx recruited one of the volunteer dentists to run their inhouse clinic and as a result no longer needed to participate in the annual dental mission. This demonstrates how Write to Read BC works, how it utilizes the concept of working with to foster participation, partnership, and power sharing. In this example it builds capacity with, creates processes and practices that allow CSOs to know when to help and when to say thank you for the shared experience. Relational accountability and responsibility of these partnerships means a relational connection continues not just with my adopted community of Tl’ésqóx, but all communities that Write to Read BC works with. For example, when community champions are troubleshooting a need in their community, they often connect with Write to Read BC. These relationships are not a ‘one off’ but ongoing commitment to ‘un-colonize’ interconnections between Settler and Indigenous communities by centring abject voices creates a diversity in thinking and equity to action through participation to create a space of belonging through power sharing.

Tl’ésqóx is the first community to participate, to partner, and to share power to complete the first library learning centre. So, the process that became Write to Read BC model of community engagement of working with the community, taking part with the
community in each decision, and utilizing the network and resources of Rotary locally and provincially was developed here. This networking enabled me to ask for help, my father’s friend a local trucker picked up and delivered the modular building, the community arranged for skilled tradesmen to connect the building, and as a favour because I helped his son build reading and math skills another local businessman donated the use of his crane truck to put the building in place. Community members came and stood with me. A few things to note, this was all done on a Sunday, and all who participate donated their time including the contractor and electrician the community had hired once they heard the story from the community’s Write to Read BC champion Shirley (Tsilhqot’in) that day. The next day, youth, Elders, parents, staff, leadership, and Rotarians work side by side to set up the shelves, books, computers, furniture, and art. The following day the community hosted an opening outside, a mix of Tsilhqot’in ceremony and protocols and Government House of BC ceremony and protocols. For example, the ceremony includes bag pipes, eagle feathers, smudging, traditional regalia, songs, blessings, ceremony, a feast, gifts, words, and a welcoming line for those involved to greet and pay gratitude to all who came. In Tl’ésqox, the relationship continues for me more formally because at the open on the centre in 2011, I am formally and traditionally adopted by the community during the public ceremony; this means I have a collective relational accountably and responsibility to the community as a whole. As a result, I have learnt and continue to learn so much and continue to be included and involved in community planning and development most of which I continue to do as a volunteer or in my professional role as a consultant, community planner, and grant writer. As Write to Read BC evolves to adapt and respond to needs and vision for literacy equity communities express more skilled professionals are now volunteering on an as needed basis, this includes librarians, early childhood experts, architects, engineers, builders, and technology specialists. Write to Read BC has also moved from the Government House Foundation to the Rotary Club of Steveston’s Charitable Society who ensure all donations are stewarded and used in accordance with the bylaws of the society and the Society Act of BC.

As described by Steven (Sto:lo), co-founder of the project, “at first there was no process. I decided to simply begin to walk in the direction of my intention and allow the process to unfold. There was no agenda or specific plan. We simply went to the communities with books, brought in members of Rotary, and the magic happened.” The “magic” he is referring to relates to how, as the project grew and other Rotarians became aware of what we were trying to do, they gave: first they gave books and then one Rotarian who became a sponsor of the project decided to give a modular trailer. The last point leads to Rotarian
David Taft’s involvement and donation of 13 modular trailers as owner of Britco. At the Tl’ésqóx library learning centre opening in 2011 he dedicated the building to his mother and all Indigenous women who had lost their status under the Indian Act. This could be seen as an example of relational reciprocity creating a sense of connection via the relational responsibility of sharing resources to honour his mother. Then others began to give from bookshelves, furniture, and then computers and software. There are now over twenty corporate sponsors of the project, and the list continues to grow; for example, Write to Read is now spreading to Ontario and its first community engagement session was held in that province in 2018. So, despite the paternalistic and at times racist attitudes within Rotary referred to earlier, there are many within the organization who see the need for tackling the literacy inequities within their own backyard.

This is not to say those attitudes do not still exist. When I first was starting the project with Tl’ésqóx, I presented the idea to other clubs in the area as well as provincially, only to be told “you’ll never be able to do that with that community” or “First Nations get enough of our tax money already” or “there are more deserving people elsewhere”. Recently comments are directed at the perceived politization of diversity and inclusion rhetoric of the organization. Locally I have witnessed comments made that the “land is everyone’s not Indigenous” or “stop the land acknowledgment nonsense”. These types of comments speak to the misconceptions within Canadian settler society of Indigenous communities and the impacts of the subtle and institutionalized forms of racism still prevalent in Settler perceptions fostered through the legislated division that isolates citizens from each other; the continued lived reality of “an imposed reserve regime” and “a centralized registration system” (Fleras & Maaka, 2010: 12). It also reinforces Craig’s (2011) arguments on how volunteers construct self and other locally versus internationally. As Green has argued “to now present the conditions for, and status of, citizenship as neutral is to dodge the entire history of the settler state, which is racist, sexist and imbued with class preference” (2009:42). Reference to the “taxes”, of perceptions of how resources are allocated to Indigenous communities, also draws attention to citizenship as politics in relations, to the power, privilege, and rights inherent within the practices and processes of social citizenship and within the interactions of Settler and Indigenous citizens. Together the CSO Rotary International and the Write to Read BC project are thus both sites of research on social citizenship and sites of social citizenship through the joint social actions of pursuing literacy and health literacy equity.
It is also interesting to note that Write to Read BC project with Tl’ésqox is still the only project to receive a Rotary International District level grant or any support from the RI Foundation. This included a second grant through the RI Foundation for the recording studio in the now renovated multigenerational facility for Elders and youth and is housed in the library learning centre for language learning and revitalization. Write to Read BC project has not received any direct government funding and thus has bypassed existing systemically racist structures within the social systems of government literacy and education programs and funding by directly engaging citizens, Settler and Indigenous, in local intercultural literacy projects. It is perhaps potentially a prototypical pathway toward intercultural change and a tool for rebuilding trust individually and through relationship by adhering to culturally responsive principle of working with not for or on behalf of. Therefore, Write to Read BC is argued to also be a site of interaction, creating potential spaces and places of knowledge production.

5.2 An intersectional indigeneity perspective of the lived experience of enacting citizenship for literacy equity – a thematic analysis

This section focuses on the thematic analysis of lived experiences of social citizenship practices and processes to explore how knowledge is produced and whose knowledge counts in the hegemonic and counter hegemonic layered and nested narratives of participants. Therefore, knowledge production is explored through the lens of intersectional indigeneity, as discussed in chapter four, and defined for the purposes of this analysis as lived, practiced, and relational heterogeneity of Indigenous narratives and worldviews as seen in the intersects of principles of indigenous difference, rights, belonging, self-determination, and spirituality (Hunt 2013; Fleras & Maaka, 2010). This lens allows for an exploration of how participants resolve and reconcile the blurring of multiple nested perceptions of social citizenship within the historical contexts of over 150 years of relationships, interactions, institutional norms, and competing ideologies and worldviews in specific interactional situations created through Write to Read BC and how involved individuals and communities differentially evoke, understand, and act upon them. Focus is on participants’ experiences of the lived, practiced, and relational aspects of social citizenship highlighting how participants’ perceptions and worldviews can provide further voice to the counter narratives of the lived experience of social citizenship knowledge production. Focussing on citizenship as lived and embodied highlights how participants’ perceptions influence not only their views on how knowledge is produced at sites of interaction, but also how gender, race, power, and positionality also influence their perceptions and realities of their agency at these sites.
Before I move on to the next section, I feel the need to again acknowledge how my role and my relationships with the participants of this first case may or may not have biased the responses and perspectives participants shared with me. I have kept this front of mind to critically look at why they wanted me to hear or witness certain things or perspectives and how this could impact what it implies.

5.3 Participants’ perceptions of the lived experience of social citizenship

This section will focus on the intersecting overlapping attitudes of the citizenship and how the historical conditions of the space, place, and settler colonial logics and mechanisms influence the lived experience of social citizenship reinforcing hegemonic narratives while at the same time giving voice to the potential counter hegemonic ones. At the end of chapter three, social citizenship was defined as a process of critical synthesis of its institutional (status and rights) and social construction (practice and participation) aspects found within the acts or agency of citizens and (non)citizens rooted in space, place, and recast or reimagined over time. Social citizenship processes and practices are argued to be a socio-political praxis that interweaves participants’ axiological, epistemological, ontological, methodological, and ideological ways of regarding, understanding, and interpreting their lived experiences of this contested concept. These attitudes of social citizenship are in some cases influenced by the historical conditions as they have contributed to the formation of both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic ideological narratives. Participants’ stories of lived experiences of social citizenship are powerful tools of knowledge production that teach morals, entertain, inspire, and transform. Stories can translate into values; they can ground us, give us identity, cultural connections, and create spaces for belonging. Stories can contain our voice and allow us to share our perceptions of self, self in relation, and self as part of a group. Notions of citizenship are therefore complex interconnected alignments and realignments of constant negotiated interplays that form convergent and divergent views. In this section, I will demonstrate how the thematic analysis uncovered the participants’ attitudes about citizenship, how they have conceptualized their own lived experience, and what it means to them. Write to Read BC as site of exploration is argued to be both a site of research on social citizenship and a site of social citizenship. To explore if CSOs like Rotary facilitate or hinder social citizenship practices and processes first requires an understanding of how the participants in this case study perceive citizenship itself.

This section is the pulling together of the perspectives of the 24 participants’ lived experience of social citizenship expressed within the interviews and narratives of the sites of interaction Write to Read BC creates. As well as how they situate these experiences into their
own broader narratives of the lived experience in relation to the macro and meso historical conditions outlined earlier. Roles and agency are expressed in accordance with both Settler and Tšilhqot’in worldviews of what social citizenship means. At times, these worldviews are not always distinct but often entangled, shapeshifting over 150 years of sharing, attempted assimilation, or integration through shared interactions and interconnections. Through the interviews, sharing circles, and observations participants shared perceptions of citizenship as rights, as reciprocity and citizenship as belonging, as relational, as spiritual. Prior to each of these data collection opportunities, participants were given information about the research topic, questions, and objectives; plus, they were all given the opportunity to revise and add to what they shared with me. This has provided the participants with the opportunity to balance spontaneous meaning making of the central phenomenon of social citizenship with time, allowing for more nuanced control of authentic crystallization in meaning creation by the participants themselves that is woven into the analytic iterations below. This process allows me to honour both the participants voice in balance with my own through continual reflexivity and textual representation (Lincoln & Guba 2000).

Perceptions of citizenship and what it means to be a citizen are seen as a practical way to define who one is as an individual and in relation to others within the community or beyond, an epistemological and axiological way of relating, a sense of belonging, as rights, as a role and a responsibility, and as something spiritual. First, I will describe and provide examples of Indigenous and Settler participants’ perceptions so that I can highlight where there is agreement in perspectives, differences, and then anything interesting or confounding.

Write to Read BC is argued as stated above to be both as a site of research on social citizenship and as a site of social citizenship, and as such allows for an interrogation of the dimension of citizenship as defined by the participants. This will allow for what follows, an exploration of how this specific CSO facilitates or hinders in relation to these perceived dimensions of social citizenship through its social actions. As a site of interaction, Write to Read BC is also argued to be a site of citizenship, a space and a place to explore whose knowledge counts and any counter narratives that centre Indigenous voices. Finally, the exploration will look at how the CSO facilitates, or not, social citizenship processes and practices by examining perceptions of its social actions.

5.3.1 Citizenship as rights: privileged and abject spaces

The Indian Act 1876 frames status Indigenous people as wards of the state, i.e., that the state is responsible from birth to death to a rights-based approach where citizenship entitlements become a matter of rights (i.e., Sellars, 2016; Helin, 2008; Maaka & Fleras, 2005,
Indigenous rights are regarded legally as sui generis, (Borrows, 2015; Henderson 2002) as being independent from the state collectively held by heterogeneous Indigenous nations, like the Tșilhqot’in, and inherent as the first people to occupy this land. These special entitlements then ought to emerge as a matter of right by virtue of this status. However, as postulated previously the continued dualism within the Canadian citizenship regimes that divides citizens under separate legislative legal realities is apparent in participants’ perceptions of citizenship as a set of rights. This in turn is synthesized with how these rights are then constructed socially in practices and processes through the acts and agency of participants in their lived experiences of social citizenship. Citizenship as rights delves into participants’ views of rights and responsibilities and how they are shaped by the continued dualism inherent with the Canadian’s state’s definition of who is what kind of citizen. As well as what if any shift has winning land title and the subsequent agreements created within the spaces and places in this case study, both privilege and abject. Participants perceive their own agency of citizenship as acts that both include and exclude certain individuals and groups through political, economic, and civic interactions that in turn create abject spaces of limited rights, inclusion, and belonging. This can be seen in participants’ experiences or observations of abject behaviours based on race and settler privilege towards Indigenous peoples, including how members of certain communities are labeled through classic ethnocentrism by employing exogenous criteria of one worldview over another.

For example, Annette (Tșilhqot’in) and Rosaline (Tșilhqot’in) both tell of racism they experienced in their interaction within the predominately Settler community of Williams Lake where they both report being told by Settlers that they come from a “do not enter” community; in turn, they both perceived the Settler community as being “racist” and “redneck”. Annette (Tșilhqot’in) tells a story of being in the hospital receiving maternity services, and how during a discussion with a Settler woman she came to realize she was being labeled as coming from “a community of fearful savages”, a place that is perceived as “the worst”, where “bad things” happen, and thus a place to “drive like heck just to get passed there”. When Annette (Tșilhqot’in) inquired further, it was clear that the woman had never even been to Tl’etinqox and was apparently making judgements based on hearing “a lot of bad things”; these judgements were surprising to Annette (Tșilhqot’in) and perhaps the generalization, the labeling, is more revealing of the preconceptions held by the Settler woman applying them. This appears to be a hangover or continuation of tenets of a scientific view that had been saturated with Christian and Euro-American male notions of hierarchical paternal ‘norms’ of understandings of human origins, a social Darwinist view from savage to
civilize (Wellburn 2012; Darnell 2008). This view of First Nations people continues today not just in the perceptions of participants’ lived experience of social interactions, but it underpins the discourse of resource development in Canada and is reproduced in the news media (Henry and Tator, 2002).

Settler participants also agree that labeling and racial stereotyping framed things from exogenous criteria. June’s† (Settler) perception was that “labeling and classifying people” was a “Canadian issue” of external classification that often led in her experience to disconnection and disagreement both internally and externally when these labels are used as a form of self-identification. She felt that “people segregate people, and it is worse in rural areas” and this is layered and made more prominent because distant urban “governments and bureaucracies need to label”. It is the way we communicate, to categorize, to label and it can be both good and bad. June† continued by saying, “I believe we have no rights by virtue of being born. Rights are a dangerous, nasty, wicked label”. June’s† choice of words highlight how rights can abjectify, have the power to include and exclude, and are based on criteria typically externally determined. “Labels are how others see us. This is why re-categorizing is so terribly important. But a label is essentializing and only a slice of the picture.” Bruce’s† (Settler) experience working with perceived marginalized Indigenous communities, both within the region and internationally, led him to articulate that these labels, or privileged views, are based on the notion of “a hierarchy that they are coming from a more enlightened, higher developed background, a background, a perspective, whatever… and that everything they look at simply reinforces that”. Interestingly, is his use of the pronoun “they”, a discursive device that allowed him to distance himself, even as a male settler, from views he wants to make clear he does not ascribe to; “You read text today and they still talk about the evolution of civilization, how we are somehow the epitome of it? [said using an incredulous tone and followed by laughter] We are not.” Also of interest is the inherent choice he has to do this, as Frye (1983) argues it is an “aspect of race privilege to have a choice” (p.111), the choice that is reinforced not “by nature but by political classification, and hence it is in principle possible to disaffiliate” (p.118). These hierarchical perceptions, notions of settler-colonialism, persist to present times and I would again argue as many scholars do that there is nothing post about colonialism in Canada (i.e., Lowman & Barker, 2015; Coulthard, 2014; Holmes, Hunt & Piedalue, 2014; Hunt 2014), it has simple morphed to fit the contemporary context.

---

13 This symbol † means the participant has passed away at some point during the research journey.
Participants who identified as recent immigrants highlight how settler colonialism foundations of the naturalization process of becoming a Canadian citizen formed their initial perceptions of Indigenous peoples that were then reformed in their interactions with communities through Write to Read BC. Nic believes that his experience shifted his perspective, that it helps “to see how Indigenous communities see things and it really never hit me how much they are affected”. Bob (Settler) speaks of how these experiences are “very humbling” for him to have the chance:

to live what they live because you understand more… [and how these experiences have also shifted] the way I look…at folks in our own backyard. It’s changed the way I feel about what I felt at the beginning… I still do not believe that you had to ask permission from an Indian Agent to leave the reservation. I could not believe that you were not allowed to sing your songs or speak your language. It’s basic human rights! I was allowed to. Then, why not First Nations? Why not the aboriginal peoples of this land? The first peoples to be here? We are just visitors…Then I say, where, where is the fairness?

Bob’s (Settler) perception of the ongoing abjection of Indigenous citizens historically and in the current context of continued settler colonialism logics speaks to how they also normalize Settlers’ perspectives and experiences. These politics of relation, the power of privilege and rights of some citizens is also inherent in Heather’s (Settler) impression that both immigrants and professionals compose a “certain part of the society, we are quite sheltered. We are not…there are a whole bunch of social issues, social challenges that we are not aware of.” After participating in a few dental missions with nations other the Tšilhqot’in, Heather’s (Settler) expresses the belief that the knowledge of the heterogeneity of Indigenous peoples leads to a lack of understanding of how there are “different cultures and mentalities as well’. She further adds that she thought “the mistake most people, most Canadians make, is to lump everyone together as one big group, which they are not culturally, they are different, languages are different”. An example of how immigrants are normalized via citizenship processes and practices with hegemonic narratives of ‘who’ Indigenous people in Canada are to sustain the continued settler-colonial patterns of behaviours, structures, and relationships between citizens. Settler participants Bob, Heather, and Nick’s observations could be considered an example of how continued settler colonial relations of power have become an exchange of state recognition and accommodations juxtaposed with rights to self-determination through reciprocal relational responsibility to land, language, and culture of, in
this case, the Ṯs'ilhqot'í in people. These complex social relations and intersections can both privilege or marginalize and thus imply how social citizenship practices and processes are formed intersubjectivity affecting citizens capacity to be self-determining agents. Again, this echoes what Fanon (1993) defines as an affirmative relationship between recognition and freedom related to the settler colonial states hegemonic narrative that creates ‘colonial subjects’ and modes of colonial thought, behaviour, and action both implicit and explicit in practices and processes of social citizenship. This can be seen as a “field of power through which colonial relations are produced and maintained” (Coulthard, 2014: 17).

These perpetuated views are contingent not only of the historical conditions outlined earlier but also form some of the foundational knowledge of privileged settler colonialism that afforded the rationalization for dispossession from the land, assimilation policies, and creation of the Indian Residential School system. As proposed, the re-problematizing of the Canadian context as being a state of continued settler colonialism allows for a re-exploration of how this re-framing of political or civil space as abject, as exclusionary, and as marginalizing impacts interactions and relationships. This includes “the refusal to recognize white settler colonial violence as a pervasive and ongoing reality in Canada” (Holmes, et al., 2014: 545). This is also revealed in how Ṯs'ilhqot’í participants expressions of their Indian Residential School experience create ‘contingencies of meaning’ and influence their worldviews and perceptions of ‘midugh’ (Settlers). Roger (Ṯs'ilhqot’í) shares that it is not until he was taken to Residential School that he first experiences “segregation” as students at the St. Joseph Mission were separated by age, gender, and Nation. There is among Ṯs'ilhqot’í participants a persistent perception that “being taken away” from family, community, and the land was worse than the psychological, physical, emotional, and sexual abuses many suffered. Not being allowed to learn or to speak their language and practices their culture or ceremonies leads to the impression that non-Ṯs'ilhqot’í epistemologies, ontologies, methodologies, and axiologies are now integrated into their communities as a result. Annette (Ṯs'ilhqot’í) sees the experience as “putting our community, really putting us down as human beings…a lot of impact on how people feel”. Like the smallpox impact on the Nation that decimated an estimated over half of the population (Swanky, 2012), the assimilative nature of the Indian Act and Indian Residential School are turning points in power and impacts of both are considered traumas that the Nation is continuing to heal from.

As a result of these and other historical conditions, it appears that most of Ṯs'ilhqot’í participants perceive attitudes of Settlers towards them as racist, entitled, hierarchical, pedantic, patriarchal, divisive, dismissive, and disrespectful. The impression of some
participants is that little to no shift in relations between Indigenous and Settlers has occurred; while other see some Settler as allies who have helped them in the fight for their rights, especially the legal battle for Tsilhqot’in land rights, as well as key professionals who have helped their communities’ due to the rurality and lack of local services. Clay (Tsilhqot’in) shares that from his experience, “we are heavily reliant on services to help us out because in a rural community there is a lack of … everything. So, if you don’t have the resources, you are always relying on outside agencies to help you out.” As stated previously, Steven (Sto:lo) provides a perspective of the role of exclusion that also points to the role of rurality and how space and place can create segregation due to distance when citizens are separated. Others argue that it is just another form of assimilation the urbanization of the marginalized whose motivation for relocation is usually economic or educational (Satzewich & Wotherspoon, 2000). Thus, perhaps this points to why there is not as much institutional impetus to fund on-reserve service.

The perceptions of the above points lead to differential positions and initial interactions are still cautiously undertaken until the right to trust and respect are perceived. Shirley (Tsilhqot’in) reiterates this viewpoint when talking about outsiders coming to the community, “it has to be respect. They would not be allowed to do anything unless they respected the process. It is a shift. It is more of a respect for the community”. Tiara (Tsilhqot’in) also felt that outsiders should be “not all snooty; and not really investigate, not trying to go in other peoples’ business [but] be respectful”. Tiara’s (Tsilhqot’in) use of the word ‘investigate’ is interesting as it implies a connection to above points about child welfare and youth in care, to the experiences youth have with Ministry of Children and Family coming into the community to ‘investigate’ reports to how all outsiders, or Settlers are perceived. This could also imply a potential relationship to how social distress and change are mistaken for social and cultural collapse. In the next section, the exploration turns to how these initial impression during interactions with Write to Read BC, the hesitancy to trust, to see if these Settlers will be respectful and keep their word, through participation that leads to power sharing and partnership. For Rotarians in BC, Write to Read BC has become the largest and longest continuous project with Indigenous peoples across the province and remains the largest way Rotarians who are predominately Settlers and Indigenous citizens interact.

5.3.2 Social citizenship as belonging: a spectrum of relational spirituality

Citizenship as a sense of belonging can be interpreted as way of identifying or situating oneself as a citizen individually and in relation to others practically and politically.
For example, Bob (Settler) describes being a citizen as both “a sense of belonging” and a practical way of identifying “where you live or come from; my heritage is Australian, but I am a proud citizen of Canada. Citizenship allows you the rights and freedoms of the country that you live”. Similarly, Scott (Settler), also believes that “citizenship is part of defining who are you are. I am a son, a brother, a husband, a father, an architect and a Canadian… [and] it almost becomes part of introducing yourself”. He further juxtaposes this with his experience of working with Indigenous communities and people, describing his enjoyment of how First Nations people greet and introduce themselves to each other. “I enjoy the introductions of First Nations when they greet each other. It is not just a name: it is a clan, a region and a family.” This implies that how citizens identify themselves, how they see themselves in relation to other is based on different cultural norms that lead to different actions and protocols, a specific epistemological grounded place-based praxis.

Belonging can include both forms of inclusion of citizens and exclusion of (non) citizens. These dual notions of belonging can be seen in the following Settler participants perspectives of citizenship, both in what it is perceived to be and ought to be. In Bruce†’s (Settler) view “the sense of belonging is key, and you can belong to more than one place. Citizenship is bigger than family and your local community.” He expanded by saying he thought it was,

self-recognition, a sense of belonging. A lot of people view citizenship as exclusive; are you Canadian or not; Canadian or First Nations, Quebecois or Canadian? For some this is an appropriate way of viewing it. I do not view it as exclusive at all. What makes citizenship, most crucially, is a sense of belonging.

The effect of using the phrase ‘exclusive’ allows Bruce† (Settler) to share what he felt citizenship is not, thus pointing to the complex nature of this concept and the multiple perspectives of what a ‘sense of belong’ entails or not. The following examples demonstrate this, how there is implied agreement that citizenship is related to ‘belonging’ while highlighting the diversity of what that means. Jessica (Settler) feels this sense of belonging ought to be inclusive and is reflected in “how we should treat everyone no matter what gender, what colour, anything, all across the board”. Alice (Settler) agrees, claiming that for her citizenship ought to be “about equity”. Heather’s (Settler) view also highlights that the key to citizenship is “belonging”, but for her it is what she described as a sense of “home”. Larry (Settler) regards citizenship as beyond just an individual sense of belonging to one that is more communal, that it is about “being the best for your community, volunteering, doing
your part”. Dean’s (Settler) perspective of citizenship goes further, not just a sense of belonging, but one of reciprocity, claiming “it was a two-way street; if I am prepared to give 100 percent, the country has to give me a 100 percent too, right, but it has to be done with mutual respect”. For Irene (Settler) and Amarjot (Settler) both the sense of belonging is regarded as relational, temporal, and about forming connections though shared experiences.

Interestingly, Ron (Settler) believes that being a Settler citizen inherently is a form of abjection because without the displacement of the original inhabitants he, and his family, and all immigrants, all Settlers, would not have the sense of belonging described above nor privilege in society. He describes his feelings on citizenship as follows, grounding his perception within some of the historical conditions outlined earlier,

The Dominion of Canada founded in 1867 was still a fairly young place in the 20’s when my family started to arrive. For my families or any immigrant to receive land to develop, who was displaced? Those who were displaced are the same ones who are being marginalized and treated as aliens in the country of their ancestors today; not the immigrants but the original inhabitants our Indigenous peoples who were stripped of entitlement, rights, and dignities by the invasion of aliens who brought their own form of democracy that was not the way of life for the original people of the land. Citizenship is not a right that can be handed out by just anyone to anyone, nor is it a state of entitlement that one receives for being born in a certain country. It is to me much more, it is learning the ways of and hearing the lessons of life passed down from the Elders of a group of people who were here on the land we call Canada ‘first’ and growing from those experiences in a positive way so that one can be an honoured member of one’s society. To be a good citizen is to work for the good of others, to help and assist your neighbor in times of struggle and hardship. To live and work in harmony with man and nature caring for the natural resources both above and below this land we get to live on.

Implied in Ron’s (Settler) perception is the recognition of the relational connection of place to the sense of belonging, as well as recognition of settler colonial history and continued settler colonial logics combined with a call to be respectful to the First Peoples and the land. Judith (Settler) echoes this and calls for a truth telling of self, she perceives Settler citizens need to “own their history” and that in order for Canadian society to move forward requires, in her opinion, an understanding that “it is their [Indigenous peoples] time, it is their turn”. The use of these phrases “owning history” and “their turn” could imply that Settler citizens
are beginning to recognize and acknowledge the historical conditions and consequences of the legacy of continued settler colonialism in Canada and the impacts this has on citizen interactions, relationships, and quality of life for those marginalized or abjectified.

Similarly, Indigenous participants echoes the conceptualization of citizenship above as a sense of belonging, however their conceptualization are grounded in a Tŝilhqot’in worldview. For example, Shirley (Tŝilhqot’in) shares that she feels citizenship is relational, a connection to community, the land, and family that is respectful and reciprocal. Steven’s (Sto:lo) perception is also connected to place, as he felt that “we for too long have lived in isolated pockets. Indians on reserves and others in communities and cities”. This phrasing underscores how the legislative dualism discussed early has creates perceptions of exclusion of an “us and them” via the space and place citizens find themselves. This supports research by Hunt (2014) and Coulthard (2014) who argue that the creation of reserves is a material reality of colonialism that continues into the present as the ongoing mechanism of power through which colonial relations are produced and maintained. As a result of this ongoing interaction perceptions of what it means this ‘citizenship as a sense of belonging’ for some Indigenous participants has shifted to include not just the micro, but also meso and macro layers. For example, Clay (Tŝilhqot’in) also perceives citizenship to be about being a “part of something bigger than I am.” As we continued to talk, Clay (Tŝilhqot’in) expands on what this meant for him, as an Indigenous male who lives off reserve,

even though I am First Nations, I feel the need to make my place in life better. Whether it be my home, my city, my province, my country or my Tŝilhqot’in Nation. It is about belonging to something bigger than myself for the good of that place, wanting to make it better. There is no need to involve religion, or race, or anything, as it doesn’t matter if you are First Nations, born here or an immigrant. It is about having pride as a citizen, to be a force for good in the world by belonging to a bigger body of people. It is about the goals and expectations that everyone is working for the common good, for all Canadians. Labels should not be a part of it. It is simple about a sense of pride and belonging by working towards making it a better place. Belonging requires action and responsibility.

There are many layers of implied meaning in this statement. First is the notion of ‘nested’ or layered citizenship as mentioned above, and how a citizen’s sense of belonging can have multiple meanings at the same time. It could also be seen to speak to how colonial relations have possibly shifted individual Indigenous citizens views of what it means to belong to what
Fanon (1993) calls “colonized subjects”. As Coulthard (2014) argues, this “colonize subject” identity is formed “intersubjectivity through our complex interactions with other subjects” (2014:17). For both Settler and Indigenous participants citizenship as belonging is about situating yourself as an individual or in relation to others. It also is argued to be about being in relation to the land, winged, fined, feathered, and four legged for Indigenous participants. The social process and practices of being in relation also have a spiritual aspect in ceremony, songs, stories, laws, and other place-based processes and practices.

Indigenous scholars in Canada continue to view contemporary state practices within Canada as a perpetuation of colonialism with the ongoing presence of the Indian Act as a denial of the inherent rights of First Nations to be self-governing (Battiste and Semaganis, 2002; Tully, 2008). Settler-colonial discourse becomes a ‘net’ of interrelated meanings over a domain pertaining to the primary objective that is the land itself (Wolfe, 1999) and the crucial difference between citizens is the relationship to the land (Lowman & Barker 2015). From a settler colonial perspective, it is first a source of material resources, a capitalist social formation, then it morphs into an ideological control. It comes down to Frye’s (1983) argument of privilege and choice, and this privilege of choice has historically not always been a right of Indigenous citizens within the context of settler-colonialism, under the Indian Act. External labels, or external definition of citizenship under legislation like the Indian Act, are used to facilitate applications of legal precedents or policies that affect heterogeneous peoples under a common term (including in this dissertation). It also applies to the relationship to the land as unceded territories, including the Tšíłhqot’in, are subject to settler colonial policies of land claims and rights. Citizenship as belonging is thus also relational and found in the concept of “being of”, of being accountable and responsible, of being in a social relationship with the land and others grounded in individual and collective ontology, epistemology, axiology, and methodology, in the ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing.

Both Roger (Tšíłhqot’in) and Shirley (Tšíłhqot’in) believe it is about the control of the people and the land. Reserves are a mechanism of control, an example of land dispossession and the continuation of settler colonial norms that reduce vast traditional territories of Indigenous people to postage stamps to make way for permanent settler communities. In the case of the Cariboo Chilcotin region, vast tracks of lands are settled into some of the largest ranches in North America, many of which remain today bisecting Tšíłhqot’in traditional territory from all directions. Shirley (Tšíłhqot’in) feels, “it is about the money, it is about control because our people were free to move from season to season. We
were not nomadic”. For her, it is also about how the government officials perceive community knowledge, how they ignore what “the women know”, the experiential knowledge that comes from hunting, fishing, living on and with the land. The words ‘the women know’ links back to the roles of matriarchs in Tšílhqot’in society, the passing down of knowledge generationally as leaders of their families, communities, and Nation. Roles that have been silenced through colonial legacies and turn insular, inward to one’s immediate family. These colonial legacies have led to not only observable example of internalized colonization but also of the internalized patriarchy as the Indian Act not only discriminates by race but also by gender. This double discrimination means this knowledge is also not even acknowledged nor universal. Shirley (Tšílhqot’in) continues, “We are rich, with our land we are rich…I know what is right, I know what my people have been telling me for years. I know that this is the way it is, but we have to prove it in court” [laughter]. Shirley (Tšílhqot’in) feels that being a citizen, being a Tšílhqot’in women is tied intrinsically with the land, and with rights, obligations, and responsibilities of her people collectively to the land, to be in relation. “To me it was our land, like you know keeping the waters clean, respecting where we go. The animals feed us, that sustain us, that is what we are rich in”. This relational view of the land implies a different relationship. A relational relationship to the land very different from the more typical settler-centric notion of commodified free hold title that is often privileged over community knowledge and use of the same piece of land. The impact of the legacies and mechanisms of continued settler colonialism manifest in these interaction as mistrust and hesitancy especially for women who are doubly discriminated against by both race and gender. As June† (Settler), reminded me there were “processes in place before the arrival of white traders and settlers”. These processes and practices are based on the place and language creating “different perspectives as language is contextual”. For as Francis (Tšílhqot’in) shares land for the Tšílhqot’in is seen as a source of cultural strength and connection, the physical place and space of history imbedded with narratives that form their worldview, and as living entity that sustains them. The effects of participants phrasing around their connection to the land highlights the potential impacts colonial dispossession of their lands has and continues to have and the implied consequences for their culture and way of life (Perrett, 2000; Nettheim, 1988), as well as for their citizenship as belonging.  

Coulthard (2014) argues that by shifting the analytical framework of the capital notion of land from a ‘thing’ to ‘a social relation’ allows for a critical look at how settler-state governments frame continuation of land dispossession under the guise of progressive resource development and how this impacts rights and capacities of self-determination. This
is reflected in Dean (Settler), who was a girl in South Africa during and fought against apartheid, perception that the relationship between Settler and Indigenous peoples was and still is “very unequal” and she feels it is incumbent for Canada to “change the laws”, and to remember that “justice is not blind [and] justice is weighed.” The Tśilhqot’in counter narrative to the settler-states attempts to colonize them have continued from first point of contact through the Tśilhqot’in War to acts of civil disobedience in 1990’s at Tl’ésqox which led to a standoff against with the Canadian Military over forestry practices, what Francis (Tśilhqot’in) refers to as “the right to decolonization in action”. When he and the other Tśilhqot’in citizens were arrest they told the judge “we don’t have lawyers your honour, because we are here to tell the truth”. Despite the implied distrust of the colonial Canadian judicial statement, and of lawyers, inherent in the previous quote, these examples of decolonization praxis on the land eventually led to utilizing the Settler court system to fight for rights and title to Tśilhqot’in traditional territory.

The Supreme Court win in 2014, also referred to as the ‘title win’, makes Rosaline (Tśilhqot’in) feel proud as a Tśilhqot’in citizen. She perceives the win to mean that they are “not in the shadows anymore” and it makes her happy as she feels “there was always a lot of racism between natives and non-natives, so I kept saying one of these days we will be up there as they were always turning us down and stuff…it was the first thing we ever won in so long.” From Francis’ (Tśilhqot’in) perspective the case reinforces what he always felt and knew, “we do not need permission to use the land and practice our cultural traditions like fishing, hunting, and sharing of medicine and spirituality through our ceremonies as needed”.

Although the title win area only covers approximately 20 percent of traditional Tśilhqot’in territory, just the land not the water, it is perceived to be a decisive ‘battle win’ by the Nation in the ongoing ‘war’ with the Crown. It is seen as an enactment of their fundamental human rights through the use of strong language, continuing to stand up over time, and use of the enemy’s system against them (i.e., utilizing the Settler judicial system against the Crown).

The title win is regarded as giving the Nation the power to demonstrate the continued impacts of settler colonialism through imposed resource development by the province on the rights and land of Tśilhqot’in citizens. The subsequent Nenqay Deni Accord (2016) and agreements with the federal government are seen as opportunities for reconciliation through negotiated restitution. As Roger (Tśilhqot’in) puts it the impact of colonization on the Tśilhqot’in Nation from the smallpox epidemic, the Tśilhqot’in War, to Indian Residential School was like “turning power upside down” and the title win “is another medicine we’ve used to turn it back”. The effect of Roger’s (Tśilhqot’in) words show how citizenship as
The ability to be relational accountable and responsible was interrupted by dispossession, disease, genocide, war, acculturation, assimilation, and the land, specifically title, is seen as a restorative medicine that connects the Tsilhqot’in back to the land, to their roles and responsibilities through a sense of belonging. Time will tell if and how the Supreme Court decision in 2014 will impact the relationships within the territory, the region, the province, Canada, and internationally.

Belonging is linked to well being also and it is here that the expressions of what citizenship is for participants diverged. Indigenous well-being and the range of dimensions of spirituality, from reciprocity, respect, to the interconnectedness of all things, have also been linked (Fleras & Maaka, 2010, 2005; McIvor, 2010). Spirituality influences worldview, the way we know and construct axiology, epistemology, and ontology of self, ancestors, community, nature or the land, and the cosmos. As Fleras and Maaka argue this particular way of knowing for Indigenous peoples “(in)fuses the spiritual with the natural and humans in ways that often clash with Western modes of thought” (2010: 19). Citizenship as belonging is also perceived as spirituality and is linked to the relational interconnectedness with the land and all living things, is space or place based or specific, and is nested within the narratives and counter narratives of whose knowledge counts and whose ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing are centred. Tsilhqot’in constructs of spirituality also informed participants’ worldview and thus perceptions and conceptions of citizenship.

Tsilhqot’in stories are valued and passed down orally generation to generation by Elders and Knowledge Keepers, and “when told and were followed and made the person to be honest and respectful of others, or of anything like wildlife” (Tsilhqot’in Nation, 1998:10). For example, Annette’s (Tsilhqot’in) conception of citizenship is, in her words, 

like a warrior who shows respect and cares for all, who stands proud yet [is]
humble with pride, who truly believes in spirituality along with all Medicine Wheel Teachings of life. A citizen balances the four aspects of life continuously with oneself. Citizen to me means [an] individual who has status showing respect and kindness who works hard everyday within community. A person who always shows that community means whole as one and everyone in it matters. This is just a summary of Elders sharing meaning.

Implied in Annette’s (Tsilhqot’in) conception of citizenship are these traditional values of honesty and respect and also the sense of community, of being collectively relationally responsible. Also implied is the masculinization of concept of Tsilhqot’in citizenship to represented by ‘the warrior’. Rosaline (Tsilhqot’in) also speaks of how the “spirit citizens,
the deyen” are really appreciated and they are seen in as special, for in “our traditions we know the truth, the one that had a gift” had specific roles and responsibilities. For her, citizenship is represented by “our Elders…Elders are our citizens in our way”. Elders then (and now) are socially constructed as sources of authority, “Elders are our history” (Tšilhqot’in Nation, 1998: 12). Rosaline (Tšilhqot’in) goes on to share the view that “to be a citizen” is to acknowledge and honour the teaching received “generations to generation”. Roger (Tšilhqot’in) similarly regards citizenship as,

a place where everyone understands the same laws and honours the spiritual and ritual beliefs, the land, laws, and creation stories. It is respect; living it is citizenship. There is a connection to and honouring of our own beliefs, honouring them, and living by them with no other agenda. Help each other. There is freedom within this power. Always remember the impact of your actions for the next seven generations. Thinking how you can improve not just you as an individual but the communal, your family, your community, and your Nation.

The effects of these words speak to how these three participants are attempting to disentangle the role of the concept of spirituality in what citizenship means for them to a non-Tšilhqot’in (or midugh) researcher. Despite my adoption by one of these communities, I reflexively acknowledge that my epistemological understanding of Tšilhqot’in ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing is limited by a lack of language skills. Based on this acknowledgement, these words and other spiritual praxis I have observed could imply how citizenship as spirituality is conceived and practiced, from being like a “warrior” who protected the land during the Tšilhqot’in War, to ensuring you live a ‘balanced’ life in accordance with Tšilhqot’in cosmologies, and to acting in a respectful way through kind acts of reciprocity. As Francis (Tšilhqot’in) put it during a federal review panel hearing, our People are connected to the land or to the waters, in whichever way. But you know, it’s a very, like our spiritual person was saying, that our land is full of spirit, as, you know, as we all are. And I think it is a very strong connection...we get our strength from being out on our lands and our waters…if we’re out there, that’s where we feel as one with the land. And that’s where our legends come from is from the land and from the waters…whether it’s how that sacredness is connected to the land or to the water, it’s got a connection to us (CEAR#09-05-44811, 2010:2284-2885).
The effect of Francis (T̓s̓ilhqotʼín) words implies that this spiritual praxis provides him with a sense of connection, a sense of belonging, to the land and water, to being T̓s̓ilhqotʼín.

Meetings, community events, and interpersonal interactions in the T̓s̓ilhqotʼín almost always begin and end with some combination of blessing, song, and ceremony. For example, typically one of the four sacred medicines, usually sage or tobacco, is offered to the land and followed by either a blessing or a song or both. This is typically done in a mix of T̓s̓ilhqotʼín and English, as it is recognized that one of the lasting negative impacts of the Residential School legacy is the linguicide, the lose of language and language fluency of T̓s̓ilhqotʼín citizens. Participants not only view these conceptualizations and actualization of spirituality as essential to “living it”, as part of what it means to be a T̓s̓ilhqotʼín citizen, they also indicated that they ensure actions undertaken are grounded in their culture’s epistemological and ontological foundations as a right of their citizenship, a right that for years under state legislation was illegal; this linkage demonstrates how these conceptualizations of citizenship are distinct and interconnected. Citizenship as spirituality becomes a way to bring back or a way to enact, embody, and emplace cultural practices that were not allowed previous and are still not fully allowed in some settler-colonial institutions and organizations (i.e., educational institutions, non-Indigenous organizations and businesses). Lincoln and Guba (2000) argue that “the role of spirituality in human inquiry” is more than just religion but that axiology is about the values and ethics that are also inherent within a broader notion of spirituality that is linked to conceptions of oppression and freeing the human spirit, which they further argue is “a profoundly spiritual concern” (p.169).

It is not to say that examples of citizenship as spirituality are not present within Settler cosmologies or concepts of spirituality, they simply were not articulated by participants nor observed at or during these specific sites of interactions. The next section will thus focus on analysing what these participants’ perceptions can tell us about how CSOs facilitate, or not, social citizenship and how knowledge is produced in these enactments through an intersectional indigeneity lens.

5.4 CSO as Agent: The thinking and doing of social citizenship ~ the art of culturally responsive agency

Projects like Write to Read BC provide the space and place for these alternative narratives of shared lived experience to be perceived through the roles and agency inherent within social citizenship processes and practices of social service delivery and social justice action. An intersectional indigeneity advocates for a “flexible and principled approach” based on an indigeneity perspective that includes negotiations as a way to truly transfer
power and authority (Fleras and Maaka, 2010) and enables the agent to interpret reflexively their own voice and lived experience. These negotiations in turn are influenced by and influences how an agent participate, form partnerships, and share power or not. The exploration of interactions and moments of negotiation at these sites highlight the differences or alignments in rhetoric and social action that will in turn show how the CSO as agent facilitates or hinders participants’ lived experiences of social citizenship.

From Clay’s (Tsilhqot’in) experience it is about being honest, upfront about how the relationship will work,

that at that first meeting to say here is what we have, how can we work together, how can we be part of the process so that whatever we do is functional, or it is not functional…then you’ve got to go back and forth and back and forth until you can actually agree on something and then you can start the process of making it.

This implies that working with the community of Tl’ésqox became a matter of negotiating shared power and ownership. This notion of negotiating can allow for culturally and relationally responsive agency, meaning that those involved adhere to the notion of indigenous difference recognizing the different ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing how rewards and resource will be allocated, and how relationships will be built and maintained. This can be seen in a story Larry (Settler) shares of his experience of working with a rural and remote Indigenous community and when he discovers there is a necessity to be culturally responsive. He shares a story about facilitating a programme for the community and how everyone in the training was distracted because, “the oolichans were coming”. As an “urbanite”, he had no idea what oolichans are, they explained that the tiny fish are “very traditional and important for our culture”. The principles of indigeneity and notions of power here intersect, as the inherent indigenous spirituality embodied and emplaced through the traditional knowledge of importance of the oolichan run for this community.

Oolichans, also know as eulachons or candlefish, were and continue to be extremely important for Indigenous peoples’ diet in the Pacific Northwest providing nutrients and vitamins. The fish oil is unique as it is solid at room temperatures with the consistency of soft butter with a golden hue. The trails used to reach the traditional fisheries and to carry the rendered oil back for trade are known as the “Grease Trails”, including trails from the coast into the interior where the Tsilhqot’in traditional territory lies. The oil is sought after and traded, used to tan hides, and burnt in winter to provide light. In this case, Larry (Settler) could have used his role, his inherent power as the white Settler male instructor, to keep the
community members in the training but instead he chooses to be relationally and culturally responsive to the *indigenous difference* inherent in this traditional and spiritual occurrence and acknowledge the rights of community members to participate in this important annual event that reinforces a continued pattern of belonging. Thus, by being flexible Larry’s (Settler) response to allow community members to leave the training built trust and leads to the invitation to join, as they said, ‘would you come with us?’ I said yah. So, we went down, and I saw boats, small boats. I saw grandmothers and grandfathers with tykes three years old. Everyone having their bucket. And same the next day, so I said fine. After that I sat down with the class and said, ‘ok we lost 2 days, so let’s make a deal’. And, so, we negotiated. I said, ‘fine if you have special events, if you let me know’ I will say ‘ok here is what I need from you’.

Although not a part of the Write to Read BC narrative, experiences like these ones shape Larry’s (Settler) agency and through his mentorship became a part of the foundation for the engagement process with the community for the project with Tl’ésqóx. Later this culturally responsive approach became the foundation for the approach for all of them. As Steven (Sto:lo), the founder of Write to Read BC affirms, “I walked in the direction of my intention” and used his position of power as the first Indigenous Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia to redress the wrongs particularly literacy inequity and lack of social services he saw and experienced as a young Indigenous man. It highlights a possible approach CSOs can take, becoming less of the perceived continued settler colonial approach of, as Larry (Settler) described it, “I am going to solve all your problems, just shut up this is what you are going to do, and you are going to be happy” to one where community development and the lived experiences of the social citizenship practices and processes are based on a negotiated way of “a community setting their own direction”. A culturally responsive approach like this respect’s Indigenous representation, recognition, and rights to determine how resources are allocated and employed for community development. This can be interpreted as a value-laden process that is perceived by participants to be about an honest approach that can rebuild trust.

Focusing on under served remote and rural Indigenous communities, Write to Read BC’s intention is to acknowledge and work with the community in order to mitigate the abject lived experience of social citizenship under the continued settler colonial context. From Bob’s (Settler) perspective, the other founder of the project, it is, “seeing something wrong and trying to do something to right that wrong…[by] adopting a community, and the
library was a foot in the door to help that community build itself”. Ron (Settler) views it as a way that,
bypasses government [laughter], we bypassed government and we don’t have the bureaucratic bull crap…and we are genuine, and we are honest, and we are open, and face to face in our discussions; we hear what each other has to say with respect…but by avoiding all the bureaucratic bullshit we can decide what to do.

These two reflections are representative of the impression of many of the Rotarian involved of the government’s less than stellar record of working with Indigenous peoples in Canada, that it is up to the citizens to work together to correct the abject legacies of colonialism. These impressions are also supported by statistics on quality of life of Indigenous peoples in Canada shared previously and these statistics were used to justify the intent and need for projects like Write to Read BC. Rotarians involved share that they feel the government has failed and it is “about time” to do something with their fellow citizens. That is not to say, as discussed earlier, that there are other Rotarians who disagree; this is not surprising giving the statistic that 14 percent of Canadians are “dismissive naysayers” according to the Canadian Public Opinion on Aboriginal Peoples Final Report (Neuman, 2016). The report argues this group “is the most negative of non-Aboriginal Canadians and embody much of the visceral resentment that sometimes emerges in online commentary and racist incidents” (ibid:47). Therefore, it is argued here that these sites of interaction also provide opportunities for Settlers to learn and experience other ways of knowing and doing, ways of perceiving and valuing that leads to further opportunities for participation, partnerships, and power sharing.

Relationship building and learning are ongoing processes of agency as can also be seen in the perceptions of Write to Read BC’s actions. Building relationships based on trust and the notion of being a part of or working with is key as Clay (Tsilhqot’in) also points out, it is very important to be a part of the process because if you are a part of the process community members will take ownership and they will actually use whatever …that is being provided. If they are not part of the process, they won’t use it. But if they are a part of the process and they are consulted and they are a part of it, they take ownership of it; they will use it. If they don’t and they are not part of it, and it’s just thrown at them they won’t use it. However, it is not to say the project has not faced challenges nor colonizing bureaucratic attempts, effects and actions based on misunderstandings. For example, during the initial dental literacy mission with Tl’etinqox, the project’s partner University of British Columbia
(UBC) bureaucratic perspective led to some participants attempting to set the parameters of service within the community. The UBC administrative team tried to dictate in the first year that the dental mission was to be an “Indigenous only dental mission for community members only”; however, the community of Tl’etinqox quickly demonstrated that this is not how things work in the rural and remote regions as it is also about building bridges by offering and sharing what services are or become available with other Tŝilhqot’in communities and their Settler neighbours. This is a current example of their ongoing relational territorial epistemology and ontology of being in relation with their énay/éna and Settler neighbors. By adhering to this cultural protocol or the customary way of doing, it not only creates stronger connections across the region but also allows the community to guide the projects framing of belonging, of who is allowed to participate. It becomes an example also of whose knowledge counts, of power through who is including whom; in this case the community knowledge counts and Write to Read BC is invited into participate in their processes and practices of social citizenship through joint social actions.

This is also interpreted as another example how the site of interaction Write to Read BC creates is not only a space of social relations, but also a political one as each Indigenous community establishes the terms of constructive engagement on the basis of non-colonial relations mentioned earlier. Another example of this is that every community in the province that has participated with Write to Read thus far reports that there are the combined challenges to literacy and health initiatives, and this is partially due to underfunding and being continual turned down for both provincial and federal funds. They all actively participate in solving a community development and infrastructure challenge through partnerships and power sharing in a joint resourcing project. The first 20 library learning centres and all dental missions are funded without federal or provincial support. It is seen by participants as a way to break down artificial political barriers often imposed on Indigenous communities by the Department of Indigenous and Northern Affairs (INAC) through legislated oppression. As mentioned above, this is reflected in the national statistics around literacy and educational infrastructure and capital needs of Indigenous communities. This breaking down of artificial barriers for a community is highlighted in the CBC Document on Write to Read BC project (McCue, 2014, May 26). In the documentary former Chief Michael Harry of the Malahat First Nations, another community who participated in Write to Read.

14 On August 28, 2017, Prime Minister Justin Trudeau announced the dissolution of Indigenous and Northern Affairs Canada (INAC) and the creation of two new departments: Crown-Indigenous Relations and Northern Affairs Canada (CIRNAC) and Indigenous Services Canada (ISC)
says this was the most “joyous” part of doing the project as it was built entirely from donated services and fundraising without any federal or provincial support. "It’s showed the government that we can do this without them, and we want to thrive,” said Harry. “But more importantly, we want to create relationships with external communities surrounding us." (ibid). This attitude towards the role of government and towards the failure to provide sufficient funding for health spaces and places for learning conveys the impression that Write to Read BC is viewed as a site of interaction based on the principles of partnership, participation, and power sharing. This could be further seen as agency as resilience, as participating communities through partnering, directly participating in, and sharing the power and responsibility for the project demonstrates how the constraints and barriers of continued settler colonialism can be overcome as communities get organized to try to affect change. Partnership, participation, and power sharing processes foster the coming together of citizens, Indigenous and Settler, privilege and marginalized/abject, and “can transform subjectivities and identities so that political agency is developed and strengthened” (Lister 2004: 153 summarizing Buhaenko, Flower & Smith 2003).

5.5 Acknowledging interlocking oppressions, power, and agency through indigenous difference and indigenous self-determination

In accordance with an intersectional indigeneity approach, it is essential to centre the concepts of colonialism, activism, and sovereignty when considering how knowledge is produced through Write to Read BC, otherwise known as the site of interaction. Framed another way, it offers a consideration of whose knowledge counts in sites of interactions between legislatively marginalized and privileged citizens. Participants’ narratives tell us about how they orient towards literacy equity and how their differing experiences of lived, practiced, and relational aspect of social citizenship influence the interactions between Indigenous and Settler citizens. The first step is to acknowledge the concept of indigenous difference and how it provides the opportunity to not only acknowledge the constitutional concept of first among equals, of nations within, but also of the heterogeneity of Indigenous worldviews and voices (Hunt, 2013; Fleras & Maaka, 2010, 2005). Next the intersectional indigeneity approach enables the focus to shift to the lived, practiced, and relational aspect of social citizenship thought the lens of indigenous self-determination through exploring the perceptions and relations formed in the space between of Write to Read BC. Indigenous self determination, Fleras and Maaka (2010) argue, is rooted in the original occupation of the land by sovereign political communities of people who are seeking (for the most part) relative and relational autonomy. This lens also allows us to explore how the logics and legacies of
colonialism influence and are redressed by Write to Read BC (or not). Finally, the analysis shifts to whose knowledge counts and how participants construct agency in their lived experience highlights counter narratives. These counter narratives are teased out as they are often nested and blurred within the lived, practiced, and relational aspects of social citizenship. By exploring these counter narratives of resistance to the abjection of the persistent inequalities of continued settler colonialism indigenous difference and indigenous self-determination are fundamental and highlight how agency as resiliency takes form. Indigenous difference and self-determination are also fundamental to the relationship with the continued settler colonial state as a foundation of identity, as linked to unceded rights, as concessions, and as claims that include the land and in forms of laws and social norms that govern citizens. Indigenous difference is about heterogeneous unextinguished powers and entitlements embedded within a cultural lived and living reality. It is about the inclusion of diverse knowledges not just the dominant hegemonic settler colonial perspectives. Fleras and Maaka (2010) have argued that indigenous difference is process of power-sharing through partnership and participation.

As a site of interaction, a potential site of knowledge production, Write to Read with the communities of Tl’ésqóx and Tl’étéinqóx is argued to be a site of indigenous difference as power is shared between Indigenous and Settler participants at each site through formal and informal partnerships and participation. From Steven’s (Sto:lo) perspective,

Write to Read has become a door through which local Rotarians [Settlers] and First Nations can meet and share ideas, create opportunities, and achieve mutual goals and objectives. We all benefit when we can find ways to work together to solve local issues.

In this case it is the social issue of literacy equity. Steven (Sto:lo) perceives that these power sharing moments are experienced “without the need for government introduction or monitoring, or even funding”. This phrasing implies that literacy equity is an avenue towards reconciliation that everyday citizens can participate in, as well as create partnerships and share power. Write to Read BC has the potential to offer a social justice approach for addressing Canadian society’s complacency and inaction towards literacy inequity between Indigenous and Settler citizens. In creating spaces and places for Indigenous and Settler citizens to interact. Write to Read BC has become as Bob (Settler) puts it, “90 percent literacy equity and 10 percent advocacy for social injustice”; the advocacy piece is fourfold: advocating with the community for literacy equity resources and spaces, utilizing the Rotary network to help community meet their aims, fostering inclusion by standing up to
discrimination, oppression, and marginalization, and educating members and the Settler communities. For Bob (Settler), this implies that Write to Read BC represents reconciliation in action; a way, a how to do respectful collaboration.

Respectful collaboration and action towards reconciliation are key as almost all of the Indigenous participants are Indian Residential School survivors, and this influences trust and the willingness to participate. The continued and lasting effects of the trauma and intergenerational trauma experienced because of the Indian Residential School within the communities under exploration continues to influence the relationship towards education and health. Annette (Tsilhqot’in) shares of her own personal experience as a survivor of this legacy and she feels it had put her and her community “down as human beings, so that it has a lot of impact on how the people feel”. Children are seen as gifts from the creator, and when the centre of the community is removed generation after generation it creates an environment of real distrust, and many are hesitant to share with outsiders. For example, during sharing circles in both communities, and during both projects, Indigenous participants shared that from the community’s perspective that the socio-historical relationship with ‘outsiders’, with midugh, is one of taking from the land, less resources, fewer services, and even taking the children. The community, especially in the first year of the dental mission with Tl’etinqox, I observed, hung back, and watched, as Annette (Tsilhqot’in) explains, “to really see, are they part of the community or is it all just a show and then they are going to go away?” From Rosaline’s (Tsilhqot’in) perspective it is about trust, “a test” to see if the community could trust these outsiders based on the experience the community members who participated in this first year. This stance and observed hesitancy of community members to engage during the first year is indicative of the lack to trust as a result of the legacy of ongoing settler colonial violence that is directly related to the socio-historical conditions and ongoing polices directly linked to the Indian Act. As Bruce† (Settler) expressed it, this policy is about, the notion that these poor savages are not capable of looking after themselves so we have to protect them… ’get the Indian out of the child’ kind of thing, the sooner, the faster, the better we can make them like us, the better.

The use of this type of wording could be seen as a reflection of the values of the time of how children are treated, for in Bruce’s† (Settler) opinion, in the context of the British experience which was the elite experience of a 150 years ago, that’s what you did to your kids. At six you send them off to boarding school screaming, bawling their eyes out…to make a man of you.
This however is not in accordance with the Tšilhqot’in worldview that puts children at the centre, surrounded first by Elders and females, but also by the rest of the community. This worldview is clearly stated during both projects and children, both today’s and “those yet to come”, are often cited as the reason why the community is working with Write to Read BC, partnering and participating more as trust is established and relationships built through the collaborative process lead by the community. This becomes the iterative responsive model of collaborating with and thus each community leads the project ensuring each is localized.

The importance of trust in establishing who is including who is what drives participation and promotes power sharing in the lived, practiced, and relational aspects of social citizenship. Therefore, it is also argued that this lack of trust is reflected in a community narrative that was shared numerous times during the three years Write to Read BC did a dental mission with Tl’etinqóx. Health literacy, particularly dental health literacy is identified by the community as a priority. The narrative is one that I also heard during the local Truth and Reconciliation survivors’ disclosure hearings. The community narrative centres around a story of how a nun at ‘the mission’ had broken a young Tl’etinqóx child’s neck while she forcibly extracted a tooth without anesthesia or proper dental tools or skills. It became essential that, as Annette (Tšilhqot’in) puts it, the Rotarians and dental students participating are “sensitive to the needs because ‘dentist’ is a fearful word, very fearful word and I didn’t realize how much until the dentists came to Anaham [English name for the community]”.

This is linked to another essential part of the project, that the literacy service, whether library or dental, happens within the community and with and guided by the community. Interactions with dentist before the health literacy project with Write to Read BC are outside the community in Settler spaces in urban centres that often requires hours of travel and expense that many could not afford. Participants also mention reports of systematic racism and discrimination in these Settler spaces. Therefore, it is so important that Write to Read BC stayed as Annette (Tšilhqot’in) puts it,

*to try and fit them somewhere in the community so they stay in the community and be part of the community and eat our traditional foods…It worked because trust was gained, trust was built and that they were able to stay in the community. Stay and connected with the community. That it was not just oh dental mission and then nothing. They were there in the evening, and they were participating in different activities, so community members started coming because ‘we want to see how much they participate’.*
In this way power sharing is argued to be about “who” is including “whom” and in this case it is the community including Write to Read BC using their own narrative to frame the social actions, the processes, and practices of social citizenship specific to that space and place.

*Indigenous self-determination*, the ability to establish relative and relational autonomy, a community’s agency is often constrained by a lack of services, or material resources and power. Previously, as Rosaline (Tšilhqot’in) and Annette (Tšilhqot’in) explained to me it is quite an expense, quite a time commitment, and for many community members that creates a barrier. A barrier that is both financial and about accessibility due to lack of reliable personal and public transportation to accessing dental services as they often have to come up with the resources to make the almost 500-kilometre round trip to the clinics in Williams Lake or Quesnel that provide dental services covered under the *Indian Act* health provision. Rosaline (Tšilhqot’in) goes on to explain this is why she initially supported and remained involved every year in the Write to Read BC dental mission with her community, saying, “I supported it because we do not have hardly any services, hardly any dental in our community”. Despite these constraints, for Annette (Tšilhqot’in), the Write to Read BC dental mission in her community is seen as healing through the rebuilding of trust with dental health as the community interacted with the dental students and to see “how keen they are to want to learn, wanting to be a part of the community”. By the third year this hesitancy on the part of community is no longer observable as trust appears to have been built, for as Rosaline (Tšilhqot’in) realizes “we have opened their eyes”. This is also recognized by the dental students themselves, for example Nick (Settler) reflects that participating in the mission, living in the community,

really helps me to see how Indigenous community sees things and really never hit me how much they have been affected… but it really sort of didn’t click in until actually the second time I came here because I saw how much Rosaline (Tšilhqot’in) had changed over the time.

Attention to these types of subjectivities, the perception of participants of each other, could be tied to the temporal aspect of the sense of place, of belonging, and of taking part in a collective action as the project progresses from year to year.

The lived experience of participation for both Rosaline (Tšilhqot’in) and the dental students through this partnership suggests power sharing increases self development through gaining skills, competencies, and a sense of self. Collective and cultural terms provide the ontological and categorical interrelated elements of social citizenship, and as Lister (2004) argues when combined with the aforementioned subjectivities of the participants can be
viewed as political agency. Write to Read BC as the site of interaction explicitly sets out to establish working with the community to build trust to centre their aim in any joint literacy equity project. The approach of intersectional indigeneity, focused on lens of *indigenous difference* and *indigenous self-determination* help spotlight how these examples through centring the community’s narrative(s), their ways of being, the ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing is a way of fostering trust by working with to create inclusive spaces and places.

Lister argues that this type of agency is exerted in the context of personal and social relations and taking part in something collectively can be both enabling and constraining. Bhattachryya, Baptiste, Setah, and Williams (2012) show how constraints at the macro level for Tšilhqot’in people are destabilized by the micro level assertion of identity and culture directly tied to place. This allows for Tšilhqot’in citizenship assertion through rights, responsibilities to the land, social institutions, and the people through a cultivation of political agency that focuses on the complex relationship of community health, cultural well-being, and quality of life. The capacity for political agency is tied directly to self-esteem which enables participants to ‘get organized’ and act as citizens despite structural or in this case the socio-historical constraints inherent in the context of continued settler colonialism. This capacity is also related to the resources available to the individual or collectively to the community including literacy.

Contextual facts stated previously that show child poverty rates have risen to more than 60 percent for all Indigenous children living on reserve (MacDonald & Wilson, 2016) and thus they face several practical barriers including a struggle for day-to-day survival. I argue that this reflects the patterns of persistent inequality inherent in the historical and current processes and practices of continued settler colonialism and the intersections of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency. The narratives of lived experience shared by the Indigenous participants point towards a capacity of not only survival but of adverse lived experience over time, over generations, which implies a form of agency as resilience at both the community and individual level. This concept of agency as resilience is formed from the participants construction of their lived experiences shared through the interactions facilitated by Write to Read that produces knowledge through the lived, the practiced, and the relational aspects of social citizenship.

Kirmayer, Dandeneau, Marshall, Phillips, and Williamson (2011) define resiliency as “a dynamic process of social and psychological adaptation and transformation…from historical and current stresses” (2011:85). Previous research that was done regionally in the
Cariboo Chilcotin shows that literacy and essential skills are the threads that weave together and connect all other social determinants of health of a community (CCBAC, 2007). Especially for a community’s or the communities’ resiliency when subjected to the challenges of boom-and-bust resource economies. Therefore, I argue that the social determinants of health of a community are connected to the capacity for resilience and are linked together by the thread of literacy. For example, from Larry’s (Settler) point of view, Canada is a country where there should be no excuse for people not reading or learning to read…I mean why wouldn’t you want kids to learn how to read? I mean it opens up a whole world and…is near the top of the list…for their own wellbeing.

This statement is indicative of why participants, both Indigenous and Settler, in this study view Write to Read, both library and dental, as important for there is the inherent possibility to build literacy levels, essential skills, and health which in turn will increase community resiliency. Also, “traditional learning and modern education are not framed by leaders as being mutually exclusive” (Bhattacharya et al., 2012: 222) within the Tšilhqot’in Nation. This was also implied by Joe Alphonse, elected Chief of Tl’etinqox, in his comment that “education is the new battlefield” (Personal Communication, 2015). What Joe appears to be getting at here is the internal belief that the Tšilhqot’in have continued to be ‘at war’ with the Crown since the Chilcotin War and that the title case win is perceived as a decisive battle win. Education is seen as the next ‘field’ of battle to continue the rebuilding of capacity and redressing of the colonial impacts by Tšilhqot’in for Tšilhqot’in with key partners of their choosing.

It is difficult to make education the new “battlefield” if a community lacks the necessary resources and infrastructure to address its own literacy equity, especially in light the apparent negative attitudes towards education as a result of the Indian Residential School legacy. For example, in the first community to do a project in collaboration with Rotary in what would become Write to Read BC, Shirley (Tšilhqot’in) describes the lack of literacy resources and services in her community of Tl’ésqóx. Prior to the project the community only had a set of Encyclopedia Britannica from the 1960s available in the Band Office along with a few donated tattered books of fiction. An Elder in the community observed during one of the initial project meetings, “you cannot learn to read if there’s nothing to read”. As Clay (Tšilhqot’in) points out, Write to Read BC in Tl’ésqóx is “dealing with a rural community and we don’t have the resources”. So, Shirley (Tšilhqot’in) explains to me why she said yes
when I asked if anyone would be interested in working with Rotary to build literacy equity, she states,

I think it was more for our kid going into town [100-kilometre round trip to Williams Lake], with the way the roads are in the winter…to the [closest public] library, to get them into books, into reading…it was kind of scary. Here she is referring to the highway through the mountains to town in the winter. She continues by saying,

I have been reading all my life, I think since I was really young, so it was something that we started. You know we started to get them into books, start them reading. That is why I said yes because it is my interest in books.

Shirley’s (Tśilhqot’in) words highlight it’s not just why Write to Read BC is doing this, i.e., literacy equity, but how it is doing that has the effect that it does through working with the communities, centring their narratives to drive the process and practices of the social action within these jointly created spaces. Clay (Tśilhqot’in) further attests to this in his perception of the importance of getting children to read:

And the only way that they start reading is by having the parents and somebody read to them. So, when you are dealing with poverty or people that do not have the resources that other people have, you can’t go buy a box of books like that. But now with a donation like that then and the full library we do have, parents can go up, grandmothers, grandfathers can go up. Even older students can go up. And there is no reason they cannot grab a book, bring it down and they could read a book every single night at bedtime.

It is important to acknowledge although the available statistics demonstrate the literacy inequities of Indigenous people in the province and country, they do not measure Indigenous ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing or culturally based literacies. Instead, as Bruce† (Settler) pointed out, understanding that after “talking to Elders…with First Nations, literacy and even the capacity to use English well is not a reflection of intelligence or wisdom”. This implies that it is not just about getting the literacy service out to the communities, but just as important is a space and place to learn with the materials the community needs to pursue multigenerational literacy building, again demonstrates this is also about how Write to Read BC is doing this that helps. For example, including language and cultural literacies that are developed and controlled locally. By viewing participants perspectives on the importance addressing literacy inequities as extensions of larger sociopolitical processes embedded within the historical conditions, the
relationships with education because of Indian Residential Schools and the lack of local resources the true impact of these inequities can be revealed. These communities have been underserved and underfunded creating not just literacy inequalities but abject levels of poverty, appalling housing conditions, as well as degradation of health, social, political, and economic conditions as a result of the continued settler colonialism. It also creates resiliency and counter narratives of resistance, richness, rematriation, and rights.

**5.5.1 Agency as resilience ~ Knowledge as Tsilhqot’in rights**

The recognition of rights and title through the Tsilhqot’in v. British Columbia (2014) is argued, in accordance with to Kirmaryer et al. (2011) position, to have enhanced collective and individual self-esteem. Political agency is linked with self-esteem as is agency as resilience. Therefore, it is not only a form of political agency observable throughout the Tsilhqot’in Nation but also argued to be agency as resilience to continued settler colonialism. Originally, the case was not a part of this research but as I began my field research it became apparent that it permeates almost every interview with Tsilhqot’in participant (and some Settler participants), sharing circle, and community observation. Although not directly related to Write to Read BC or CSO Rotary, the connection is linked to the sites of exploration in this case as they are Tsilhqot’in and the ‘title win’ is intertwined into the participants perspectives as data collection occurred after. The case and land title win I argue is another example of agency as resilience and ties back to the Tsilhqot’in principle stated earlier of ‘our identity is bond to the nen’ (the land). It also links to the overall intent of Write to Read BC continue to work with communities to build literacy skills and health of the communities and to add to the capacity to engage with the rest of society while continuing to adhere to the cultural ethic of caretaking. This can also be inferred from the examples of the perceptions of participants of the case as shared at the end of the last section. Community observations during the Minister of Crown-Indigenous Relations’ visit to Tl’ésqóx in 2018 to sign the letter of intent with the Nation on behalf of the federal government reinforce these perceptions as the Tsilhqot’in citizens present made it clear that they continue to be weary and do not trust the government. One Elder stated that the government will have to prove the trustworthiness of its “pretty words” of the agreement through “action and restitution”. The importance of the relationship to the land (Bhattachryya et al 2012) how the notion of respect is a core aspect of this relationship is also implied. It is stressed that there is a cultural belief that there is inherent knowledge in the land that links Tsilhqot’in identity and sense of place. This profound sense of being of a place is also demonstrated by Dinwoodie (2002) research with the Nation, and he argues that for the Tsilhqot’in people the sense of ‘who we are’, their
identity, is interwoven throughout time to place. Tsilhqot’in agency as resiliency is thus seen to be also bound to the nen (the land) and fundamental to the fluidity of self in relation, of what it means to be Tsilhqot’in citizen.

Despite these abject realities of the quality of life under continued settler colonialism, the structural problem of colonial recognition, and the acknowledgement of the continued impact of both there is also present throughout the Tsilhqot’in at the individual and communal level agency as resiliency. The land title win appears to have provided an impetus for what Coulthard calls a “resurgent politics of recognition premised on self-actualization, direct action, and the resurgence of cultural practices that are attentive to the subjective and structural composition of settler-colonial power” (2014: 24). Participation in Write to Read BC could be considered to reinforce this notion of “direct action”: through constructive agreement and negotiation based on citizen-to-citizen non-colonial relations. Also, throughout these interviews and narratives it is evident that the Supreme court decision has the potential to reframe socio-cultural and socio-political roles and agency.

5.6 A Summary of the exploration and analytic findings

The chapter presented the findings of the first case on British Columbia, Tsilhqot’in, and Rotary’s Write to Read BC project. Participants perspectives on the sites of interactions allowed for the exploration of these perceptions and realities of roles and interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in the lived experiences of social citizenship processes and practices.

Based on this analysis of citizenship as rights, as reciprocity and citizenship as belonging, as relational, as spiritual I argue that there are two divergent participant perceptions of social citizenship as self, self in relation, and self as part of a larger community. The historical conditions of the continued state of settler colonialism in Canada, and in this case with the Cariboo Chilcotin Region of British Columbia, creates an interweaving of both the internal and external categorization of what is understood to constitute citizenship. Based on the interview data, document analysis, and relevant literature review, I outline the Settler and an Indigenous-Tsilhqot’in view. Typically, they are divergent views as the Settler one is often perceived to be linear, hierarchical, individualistic, patriarchal, consumption-based, practical, and rights based. The Indigenous-Tsilhqot’in view is holistic, interconnected, matrilineal, sustainable, and spiritual. The analysis of participants’ perspectives shared in this section demonstrates how roles and agency are expressed in accordance with these worldviews of what social citizenship means. They also demonstrate how at times the distinction is not always evident as the lines between these views have been
blurred due to years of interactions and interconnection. The concern is how research tends to seek categorization of concepts by dichotomized citizens experiences and often radically decontextualizing and destructing local meaning.

Sometimes, however, as stated, the views between and among citizen, Indigenous and Settler alike, are not as dichotomously opposed and do tend to blur and overlap in participants definitions of social citizenship. This is also true when participants related their constructions about why Write to Read BC was and is so important and how this process of social citizenship praxis within these interactions changes views, builds bridges, and reframes relationships as discussed in the last section. However, historical conditions help to demonstrate how the notion of settler-privilege is evident throughout these narratives of lived experiences of social citizenship.

By deliberately shifting to look at the relationship between people and institutions of power (Tuck & Yang, 2014) through the processes and practices of the CSOs allows for a critical examination of the perception of CSOs as spaces between, as potential sites of interactions, unrealized opportunities, and of spaces where the voices of marginalized or abjectified citizens create alternative or counter hegemonic narratives and praxis. Also, it allows for an exploration of how, or not, CSOs facilitate social citizenship processes and practices within the interactions of privilege and marginalized citizens through the discovery of shared values and the ability to do more together. It comes back to ‘whose knowledge counts’; whose epistemology and ideology is privileged and how this in turn influences the perceptions and reality of roles and agency in the lived experiences of processes and practices of social citizenship.

Partnership, participation, and power sharing in doing social justice action with communities allows for collective responsibility and learning to acknowledge the realities of the abjection the continued state of settler colonial logics create. As the space between CSOs, in this case Rotary via Write to Read BC, provide a place to learn and experience the lived, practiced, and relational nature of other ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. This leads to participation in place-based processes and practices with the community as social action is jointly enacted, embodied, and emplaced in partnership and through power sharing. Participation, partnership, and power sharing are shown in this case to build capacity through the practices of working ‘with’ abject or marginalized individuals, groups, or communities. Culturally responsive services and advocacy need to be developed through these types of shared experiences that create relational connections, relational practices, and a commitment to ongoing an un/decolonizing process and practice for all interactions and
opportunities for participation, partnership, and power sharing. Knowledge production, exchange, and impact are lived, practiced, and relational experiences that can happen at sites of interaction of privileged and marginalized citizens and can be used to overcome the constraints and barriers of continued settler colonialism as communities get organized to try to affect change. This can not only strengthen political agency but can lead to agency as resiliency.
Chapter Six: Yukon & Kwanlin Dün First Nations: Yukon Child Development Centre & the Dusk’a Headstart Learning Centre

This chapter presents the findings and thematic analysis of the second case study of my research. Case two focuses on Indigenous and Settler participants who are involved with the CSO Yukon Child Development Centre at its main centre and its office embedded within the Dusk’a Headstart Family Learning Centre in what is now called the Yukon Territory within the last 10 years. It is a second story of the potential of CSOs to create spaces and places for political agency through a spectrum of social service delivery and social activism. This potential ‘space between’ can allow, or not, for marginalized or abjectified voices to be heard in the practices and processes, as well as contestation, of social citizenship. Thematic analysis of the interviews, sharing circles, observational data, and organizational documents highlight several themes. As in chapter five, participants’ narratives of their own lived experience of social citizenship processes and practices at these sites of interaction are then grouped into three overarching themes for discussion and exploration utilizing indigeneity principles in an intersectional-based approach. This is again useful as it allows for the illustration of interesting commonalities between and among groups of citizens while highlighting discernible differences, confounding points, and counter narratives.

To allow for further analysis in chapter seven that will compare and contrast data and analysis from both case studies the same structure will be used to explore first participants’ perceptions of citizenship to once again orient ourselves to what social citizenship is perceived to be for this case, then CSO as agent, and finally knowledge production via the dual lens of CSO as site for research on and site of social citizenship. Therefore, participants’ perceptions of their roles and interlocking oppressions, power, and agency are explored in relation to the social actions and interactions produced at both the Whitehorse and Kwanlin Dün sites. These perceptions are also situated in relation to the deductive theoretical themes of the intersecting macro and meso assertions related to the historical, social, and political landscapes or conditions citizens are nested within. Then, the unit of analysis shifts from the individual to the organizational to explore the relationship between the Yukon Child Development Centre’s organizational rhetoric (thinking) and its social action or praxis (doing) of social citizenship. Knowledge production is analyzed to explore participants’ lived experience of enacting social citizenship in both hegemonic and counter-hegemonic perspectives. This allows for similar commonalities of perceptions to be teased out in the lived, practiced, and relational aspects of knowledge production and notions of agency as resiliency. Differences in this specific site’s counter narrative of an all female CSO, female
caretakers, and the gaps in perception across generations will also be highlighted. As with the previous case, it is about the exploration of participants’ lived experiences of whether or not CSOs facilitate social citizenship practices and processes within the interactions of privilege and marginalized citizens and what this can tell us about the perceptions and reality of the role of shared values. This is determined by the participants’ remarks analyzed through an intersectional indigeneity lens. By looking into these interactions for honouring of indigenous difference it can be explored if facilitation, or not, of social citizenship occurs by looking at who is including whom into what processes and practices and how. Again, it is a question of ‘whose knowledge counts’ within these interactions. This is seen through the privileging ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing and how this in turn shapes the perception and reality of roles and interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in the lived experience of social citizenship within these partnerships, opportunities for reciprocal participation, and responsibilities through power sharing.

Before presenting the thematic analysis, I will first set the scene for this case by providing a snapshot of the research participants and then build on the description in chapter two of the sites of interaction, the CSO – Yukon Child Development Centre and the Dusk’a Headstart Learning Centre. Situating the reader within the proposed context of continued settler colonialism and the specific historical conditions previously outlined builds a situational spatial understanding of how perspectives and perceptions came to be formed in this case study. It allows for the reader to examine how the presented literature and historic conditions influence, or not, the knowledge production of social citizenship, lived experiences of participation, and their perceptions of social citizenship processes and practices. It allows for the examination of how the potential ‘space between’ created by CSOs in the relational interactions between people and organizations is also enacted, embodied, and emplaced, or not.

6.1 Participants: A Snapshot

Below is a brief depiction of those who participated in at least one sharing circle in either Whitehorse or Kwanlin Dün and those interviewed. There are nineteen individuals in total who participated, and sixteen who at the end of the research process consented to having their names and individual interview data used. This chapter combines the perspectives of sixteen participants’ lived experience of social citizenship articulated within the narratives of the sites of interaction created at both the YCDC and the Dusk’a Headstart Learning Centre. Participants are either government officials, staff at both sites, Board Members or those who receive services or advocacy from the YCDC. There are nine Indigenous participants; five of
whom self-identify from one of the First Nations communities or councils within the Yukon territory; one is an immigrant from the United States of America; two are current or past staff of Dusk’a; one is a Director of the Board for the YCDC; five are either members or receive social services or advocacy directly from Kwanlin Dün through Dusk’a, and the other three received services directly from the Whitehorse centre; two are Elders who are raising grandchildren and great-grandchildren; and all are female. There are seven Settler participants; five are non-Yukoners; three are staff of the Yukon CDC and one is a Board Member; three received services or advocacy directly from the Whitehorse centre; and six are female and one is male. Please see Appendix C for more participant information.

6.2 Yukon Child Development Centre – A bit more context

An extensive search shows that very little academic research exists on the Yukon Child Development Centre (YCDC), research found was not on the CSO specifically but on a service, program, or approach. For example, Alton (2004) utilizes the CSO as a research site to investigate how to improve transition protocol agreement efficiency and the research was done more than a decade prior to the scope of this case study. Another study focuses on the therapeutic services that child development centres in British Columbia and the Yukon provide such as early intervention therapy, infant development, and supported child development. Thus, the limited research located is beyond or not within the scope of this dissertation.

The YCDC itself conducts and does community-based research and has undergone organizational strength-based assessment as part of the centre’s accreditation process. Therefore, the following critical account of the organization relies heavily on organizational documents, plans, reports, online sources, and territorial government reports. The YCDC also shared the data from a 2014 survey the organization conducted with staff, clients, and community partners. As with the first case study, and as discussed in chapter four, due to my relational role, relationships, experiences, and research with the Cariboo Chilcotin Child Development Centre Association, I was given access to the YCDC as a site and had some knowledge of organizational processes and practices. This enables me to more quickly establish a rapport and develop enough trust so people who attended the initial information session choose to participate and then share their lived experiences. Again, the analysis is less about validity through triangulation but again employs what Lincoln and
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Guba term “crystallization” to tease out the multiplicity of truths within participants’ lived experiences of social citizenship processes and practices, for “what we see depends upon our angle of repose” (2000:181). I therefore pay close attention again to voice both my own as researcher and the participants, to be reflexive in my own critiques, and to be critical of how I textually represent both in my continued attempt to un/decolonize the presentation of the material while acknowledging my own settler privilege. Utilizing these notions of crystallization, reflexivity, and textual representation throughout the analysis, this section will start with a description of the organization and then the partnership with Kwanlin Dün and Dusk’a as these are the two sites of interaction under investigation.

The YCDC continues to “support children and families in achieving their aspirations” by working “with families and community members to provide therapeutic services and support the development needs of all Yukon from birth to kindergarten”. Beyond the relational aspects mentioned, the use of the particle “with” is another contributing factor in choosing this organization as the site of interaction to explore the power of language, of the axiological context at these spaces and places under investigation. At the time the research is conducted a gender analysis was done and 40 of the 41 staff are female, predominately Caucasian Settlers with a professional designation, except for one male bus driver. This is important to note when exploring the lived experiences of social citizenship process and practices, for as Wiebe reminds us, “thinking about citizenship as a practice in this regard [here in terms of the interaction of privileged and abject citizens] promotes us to consider how power relations take shape from the ground up” (2014:537). As well as how these power relations are constructed, re-constructed, and de-constructed in the potential spaces between for social justice and advocacy in these interactions of service delivery to families and children with special needs who are often abjectified based on the perception of disability.

6.2.1 Dusk’a: Having the Child Development Centre within the community

Unfortunately, the federal governments bi-annual performance review of Aboriginal Headstart programs in northern communities did not include the sites in the Yukon (PHAC, 2017). Similar themes of strengthening families, social connections, and social networks; promoting Indigenous language and culture, a sense of community, participation and integration of the community, and knowledge development and exchange; and customized to meet local needs were evident in the participants’ perspectives in this research of who accesses YCDC services from the Dusk’a site. Participants who access or provide services at Dusk’a all spoke of the importance of having a culturally responsive space and for many of
the Indigenous participants a space that was not, like YCDC is, attached to the colonial ministry connected to the legacy of Indian Residential Schools in the territory.

For example, Alayne (Settler) spoke of how settlers are often either unaware or have to take time to grasp “how huge” an impact intergenerational trauma and the legacies of colonialism in the territory have on “how we [YCDC] work with families and where families are at”. Her perspective implies that longitudinal nature of the relationship with Kwanlin Dün and other Indigenous communities across the territory leads to a knowledge exchange and deeper understanding of the lived experience of Indigenous children, families, and communities that access services via the YCDC. These themes are further reflected in Erin’s (Indigenous) perspective specifically of the YCDC.

The organization is phenomenal, and I am so happy to have them here and I think there is no other centre in all of the Yukon, or in Canada, that I know of that…has all the richness of language and culture and all that stuff, but also has like speech and language pathologist, child psychiatrists and like anything a child could need. We can wrap around services without even parents having to leave work if they don’t have to. They are all really professional and make such an impact in children’s lives and it is free.

These notions of cultural responsiveness imply that the YCDC at the Dusk’a site creates a space and place of inclusion.

The research focuses on participants’ lived experience of social citizenship at these sites of interactions and the space between; the following themes will be discussed in the next sections: participants’ perceptions of citizenship, their own knowledge production and agency, CSO praxis as agency, and the lived, practiced, and relational aspects of knowledge production. The analysis also explores how participants’ lived experiences are nested into their own broader narratives in relation to the macro and meso socio-historical conditions outlined earlier in chapter two. Like the case study in chapter five, I acknowledge the relational nature of this research as well given that my mother is the initial gatekeeper (at the time of the research she was the Executive Director of the Cariboo Chilcotin Child Development Centre Association) and connected me to the YCDC via the British Columbia Association of Child Development Centres of which YCDC is a member. The distinct difference in this case is I was unknown to the participants prior to the research; however, I do acknowledge that three main gatekeepers are all employed by or members of the Board for the YCDC. Their assistance in introduction to and recruitment of potential participants was invaluable. Conversely, this process may or may not have biased what participants shared or
increased the relational accountability depending on the reader’s worldview. The critical analysis that follows allows me to keep this possibility at the centre to explore why these participants wanted me to hear or witness certain aspects of their lived experience of social citizenship. As with the previous case study, utilizing a mixed-qualitative methodology (see chapter four) these potential sites of interaction are explored and the following sections lay out the inferences it led me to make. It will enable me to highlight the multi dimensionality of voice in participants’ narratives of their lived experience of social citizenship processes and practices in the relational stories of these sites of interaction and nested in the socio historic context.

Storytelling in what is now called Canada and internationally is considered a relational Indigenous process of knowledge production (Kovach, 2009, 2010; Smith, 2008; Wilson, 2008). The stories shared are analyzed to explore how knowledge is constructed in relation to the participants’ axiological, epistemological, and ontological lens. Also explored are how these ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing influence the perceptions of the partnership (CSO “doing” or living its values), participation, and power sharing (who is inviting whom to do what how) at the micro, meso, and macro levels of interactions within participants’ lived experiences of social citizenship. First, the analysis explores the participants’ perceptions of the lived experience of social citizenship as rights, as belonging, as spiritual, as reciprocal, and as relational. In this case study I also critically explore the apparent generational differences in these perceptions of social citizenship that lead to divergent views within the case as well as across both cases in the next chapter. Then, the CSO’s agency will be discussed to critically explore the YCDC’s philosophy of being open to all cultures and values and the perceptions of participants of their lived experience of how (or not) the YCDC’s values of “respect, trust, compassion and honesty” are translated into social action. It provides an in-depth understanding of the continued ‘caution’ in relationships between the Indigenous and Settler populations. In the last section the analysis shifts to the participants’ perceptions of the lived experience of how knowledge is produced in the enactments of social citizenship processes and practices, including the relationships and intersections within a space open for all families with children with special needs, a marginalized population in both Whitehorse and Kwanlin Dün.

6.3 Participants’ perceptions of the lived experience of social citizenship

In this section, I will begin the analyses of the intersecting and often overlapping perceptions of hegemonic and counter hegemonic citizenship narratives focusing on how participants’ perceptions and lived experience of social citizenship are influenced by
historical conditions of the space, place, and Settler colonial policies, processes, and practices. I utilize a thematic analysis to evidence and reveal participants’ perceptions of citizenship, how it is conceptualized, and what it means to them. Roles, agency, and notions of citizenship are articulated in accordance with both Settler, Kwanlin Dün, and a variety of Indigenous worldviews from across the territory as well as North America of what citizenship means. Indigenous participants diversity reflects the socio historical context as none of the participants are actual Kwanlin Dün citizens, although a few are Kwanlin Dün members (see land settlement section in chapter two). Citizens are counted and benefit under that community’s land settlement agreement as beneficiaries, but some communities like Kwanlin Dün provide service to all members who live in the community regardless of what moiety, band, or community they are from. Similarly, all but two of the Settler participants come from outside the territory, all of whom relocated for professional opportunities. This diversity implies the importance of understanding these shared perspectives, interactions, and interconnections as representing a small sample of the spectrum of worldviews that have collided, coexisted, and conformed over more than a century of sharing, legislated assimilation and acculturation attempts, integration, devolution, and self-determination (both agreed and contested). Data collected from interviews, sharing circles, and observations reveal participants’ perceptions of social citizenship as rights, as reciprocal and as belonging, as relational, and as spiritual. By providing participants with the research topic, questions, and objectives prior to each data collection opportunity and the opportunity to revise, add, and edit again allows me to balance the spontaneous meaning making with a more nuanced handling of authentic representation in meaning created by the participants themselves of the phenomenon of social citizenship that is intertwined into the analysis below. This process allows me to honour the participants’ voices in conjunction with my own through textual illustrations and reflexivity (Lincoln and Guba, 2000).

Perceptions of citizenship and what it means to be a citizen are seen as a way to define who you are, a political identity, a role and responsibility, as both an internal and external categorization, as a way of defining who you are as an individual and in relation to others, and as an epistemological and axiological way of relating. The participants’ perceptions and meaning making of citizenship are then grouped into themes of citizenship as rights or reciprocity and citizenship as belonging and analyzed to provide examples of what Settler and then Indigenous participants said to highlight where there is agreement in perspectives, differences, as well as confounding or interesting perspectives. As with the first case, belonging also has elements of citizenship as relational and citizenship as spiritual.
6.3.1 Citizenship as rights (reciprocity): privilege and abject spaces

External categorization of who is an Indigenous citizen has been and continues to be legislated under the Indian Act and not only frames Indigenous people as wards of the Crown, but also creates the circumstances that frame the narratives of Indigenous lived experience of social citizenship within the biased parameters of a disadvantaged minority only. Therefore, as in case one, this section on citizenship as rights delves into participants’ views of rights, reciprocities, and responsibilities. As well as how they are shaped by the continued dualism inherent with the Canadian’s state’s definition of who is what kind of citizen and what if any shifts do the land settlement agreements create within the spaces and places in this case study, both privilege and abject.

Lister (2003) argues the status (right) and the practice of citizenship can include or exclude human agents via both structure and culture. For “rights, which enable people to act and to express that agency in areas of citizens are not fixed” (ibid:198). It is the political dimension of agency in the processes and practices within the lived experience of social citizenship that highlight what level of inclusion is involved, whose knowledge counts, and the opportunities for partnership, participation, and power sharing. For Douglas (Settler) the shifts in relationships, both of self and others, are inferred to be as a result of the 30-year process of the land settlement in the Yukon, and he perceives that “self-determination is key” not only, as will be seen below, for equitable government to government relations, but for creating spaces and places that have begun to mitigate the colonial legacies and socio historic context of the Yukon. He extrapolates “how as a citizen you need to do what is important not only for yourself but for all members of a society while appreciating that some citizens are not as successful as others”. The role of reciprocity can often lead citizens to advocate, as Douglas (Settler) implies to be “driven by the desire to give back always” as well as a “strong passion to help” others and “the territory”. His statements on citizenship also imply a spectrum of reciprocity, the ability to give and receive, in the lived experience of citizenship intersecting with the socio historic, political, cultural, economic contexts to create spaces and spaces that can both privilege and marginalize citizens. At times this appears to occur simultaneously throughout the lived experience of many of the participants. Discursive use of the phrasing ‘appreciating’ inequalities in citizens experiences speaks in this example to Douglas’ settler privilege and privilege as a white male in a position of power in society. For Alayne (Settler) citizenship makes her think of,

words like belonging, that people feel included, that people…that there is equality and access. I think those three are the three things that when I think
about being a citizen. In there I definitely think of rights. I would, definitely would, include rights in there but again equal access. Rights equally. Yeah, I think that is the way I think of it. Belonging is a big piece of that. Feeling like you are part of something bigger, that you are included in.

Inferred from Alayne’s (Settler) lived experience is the implied connection between having rights and a sense of belonging in conjunction with equitable access to what those rights entail. Unstated is the connection to rights and the political power and jurisdiction to enact them or even advocate, to express one’s agency as citizen. Alayne (Settler) continues by stating,

I am sure people put the government piece in there and that is not the way I think myself. Of course, if I had to put it in a different context, I might have to include that but for myself if I think of being a citizen of something is just being a part, an equal part of something with access to bigger than yourself and feeling like you fit in and you belong.

This is the direct contrast to the lived experiences of ‘rights’ or the abjection of them as highlighted by Indigenous participants. Rights and responsibilities are framed in relational terms and tied to the land; these notions will be further explored below. Of note however, throughout my many interactions and conversations with Alayne (Settler) it is apparent she is culturally sensitive. This sensitivity and acknowledgment of other ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing positively impacts her professional service delivery, fosters partnerships, creates a space for often abjectified families, and creates opportunities for power sharing. It is also equally apparent that Alayne’s (Settler) lived experience is privileged like Douglas’ (Settler) and settler centric. It is not externally determined by acculturative discriminatory legislation defining who/what she can do – thus “the government piece” does not become part of how she defines herself. This is the direct contrast to the lived experiences of ‘rights’ or the abjection of them as stories of Indigenous participants highlight: rights and responsibilities are framed in relational terms and tied to the land. Also possible is the land settlement agreement process creates a more citizenship as rights focus for some participants.

Again, the principle of inclusiveness is expressed in citizenship as rights, politics of relations, and the power, privilege, and agency that some participants to take part and share in the political power. For Rachel (Settler),

in a broad sense citizenship is being a part of a community and having responsibilities to that community and having rights within that community
probably. I think we think of citizenship most often as a Canadian citizen, being a part of Canada but what does being part of Canada mean. I think you’ve got responsibilities to serve your community in whatever that looks like for different people, and you’ve also got rights as being a Canadian citizen.

The interplay of rights and responsibilities suggests again the intersubjectivities of citizenship processes and practices in determining whose knowledge counts in knowledge production. Rachel’s (Settler) question “what does being part of Canada mean” is inferred as having a multiplicity of meaning that can abjectify some. For her, citizenship and advocacy are linked to her articulated ideals of social justice and equity in her role as a social service provider. Her role working with some of the most marginalized families and children in her community to ensure receiving their rights is what,

drives me towards advocating and advocating with them. The more we can give people the tools to advocate for themselves not advocating for them is the most important thing…we can do a lot with families, but I also think it is really important that we give them the skills that when they transition to the schools, they can advocate for themselves. I think that is important.

The choice of words here, in particular the use of the particle ‘with’ can be viewed as a discursive device and a tacit of the process of un/decolonizing space and place through infrastructure intervention (i.e., land settlement and self-government agreements). The resulting shifts and devolution of jurisdiction creates opportunities for parentships, participation, and power sharing. Choudry and Kapoor (2010) argue that social struggles and action based on principles of inclusion are integral to the politics of knowledge production, decolonization, and rights equity.

The subjectivities of the lived experience of social citizenship are heterogenous also for Indigenous participants; however, all express how the macro and meso colonial infrastructural and material interventions adversely impacts their matrilineal rights and relational rights of the collective. For example, Kona (Indigenous) perceives citizenship to be all “about a community to belong to, your family, and a place that it is situated in”, she brings her culture with her (Treaty), and it is present even in her description of citizenship because for her Treaty is “alive and active”. It is not about the monetary exchange but the symbolism of what the exchange represents – her rights as a “Treaty person” that is continual enacted and embodied when all the signatures, including the Crown, are held accountable. Even in the Yukon, she celebrates her Treaty Day as a way to share her culture and practices with her
children and as a “comes from aways”. Kona (Indigenous) also advocates for a formal day for all Treaty people living in the Yukon as an example of agency as praxis through the enactment and accountability of those rights. She points out that unlike other immigrants or Settlers from elsewhere, assimilative practices against Indigenous people adversely impact their rights to belong to space and place; and these intersubjectivities privilege or abjectify citizens and their capacity to be self-determining agents. For Kona (Indigenous), the right to return is protected through these processes and practices of citizenship and thus she has the right “to go back to my reserve and that is why that reserve is there. So, we can always go back”. For her, this right to place creates not only the layered sense of belonging as teased out in exploring her agency in knowledge production but also in how she perceived her citizenship. Kona (Indigenous) also fully acknowledges her acculturation because of her lived experiences of social citizenship as an Indigenous woman in the agency and abjection of her lived, practiced, and relational rights. She is both Fanon’s colonized subject when accepting the external categorization of Treaty person and internalizes it and also agent of indigeneity as these enactments are symbols of accountability of the Crown in relation to Indigenous peoples.

Problematising of the context as a state of continued settler colonialism allows for examining how the spaces and places of interaction between Settlers and Indigenous citizens highlight these concurrent experiences of participants of agency and abjection. These are overlapped then with the socio historical conditions outlined earlier that have impacted the interactions and relationship within social citizenship processes and practices, including citizenship as rights. However, land settlement and self-government agreements have dealt conceptually with status and defining the devolution of the rights for only some in the Yukon. In 2019, the Tsilin Case discussed earlier demonstrates implementation of citizenship processes and practices remain complex and contested and will take time. Interactions and relationships are argued thus to also be complex and contested, full of racism, full of agency and abjection, exclusion and inclusion, separation, and interconnectedness, and all the spectrum in between. The voices of those who are abjectified, historically and currently, provide counter narratives that caution looking solely at citizenship as rights without looking at the power in whose knowledge counts in the lived experiences of infrastructural and material interventions, experienced in this case by all the female Indigenous participants. As Coulthard (2014) argues we need to be critical of structural change negotiated in a colonial context as they are often thinly veiled perpetuations of the epistemic violence of the pre-
existing colonial structures and ways of relating and interaction both among people and to the land.

6.3.2 Citizenship as belonging, the relational & spiritual ~ politics in relation

As stated in chapter five, citizenship as a sense of belonging can be constructed as practical and political way of identifying or situating oneself as a citizen individually or in relation to others, and it is expressed three ways also in this case as belonging, as relational, and as spiritual. For example, as Rachel (Settler) explanation in the last section of her perception of citizenship includes the broad terms of citizenship as belonging, as “being a part of a community” and a practical way of identifying the spatial aspect or physical place, as “being a part of Canada”. One of the biggest challenges is defining what ‘in relation’ means and in relation to who when juxtaposed to the lived reality of participants and the national rhetoric or mythology. Similarly, Sarah (Settler), also depicts citizenship as “being a part of”. She goes further to say it is

being a part of whatever community, you have kind of landed in, but also
being accepted by that community. If you are a citizen, you are a part of and accepted into that community you feel on equal footing with others.

The effect of these words emphasizes the privilege that many Settlers have in places like the Yukon where social services require skilled professionals and in this case study those roles are filled predominantly by skilled Settler women from elsewhere. Sarah (Settler) goes on to acknowledge this privilege,

I really came to realize that they [non-Indigenous] kind of live sort of oblivious, right. They really don’t understand the sequence of event that has led to people being marginalized in the Yukon. So, I hope …that we begin to create a community in Whitehorse where everyone truly feels like citizens.

Her perception implies a macro and meso level connection to how the Settler community is normalized through a national and local education system to believe a certain myth or a certain perspective of Canada that is not necessarily inclusive of all the wealth of culture and experiences across this nation. These colonially infused perceptions create spaces and places of abjection, uncertainty, and fear of ‘the other’. As a result of macro level changes due to the land settlement agreements an environment has been created where the Settler community perceive a sense of loss of belonging. As Sarah (Settler) states,

I think to …to people we are now many generations in Canada, so if we say this land belongs to them, then where do I belong? Right? So, if I say this is their land, but yet I have lived here, my family has lived here for many
generations, three or four generation… there is a sense of that so ok now what?
Sarah’s (Settler) articulation of this prevalent, yet often unspoken perception in the Yukon, speaks to this uncertainty and implies the need for continued un/decolonizing of our education systems to foster honesty and change the myths of this nation to create more spaces and places of empathy. Her observations speak to a context, a space and place that is still racist, more so than it appears. This is an aspect of the space and place that is also highlighted by other participants. Thus spaces, like the YCDC, of empathy have the potential to be places not just of diversity but of intentional inclusion creating belonging that builds understanding of others who have a different way of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing and who have different experiences.

Countering the abjection her child encounters because of his “invisible disability”, Kate (Settler) is teaching her children being a citizen means you belong, that, it doesn’t matter where you are standing, we are all kind of the same. I am just glad to have some, more of the rights and freedoms we have, I’m appreciative of that but there is always room for improvement.

Her experience demonstrates the heterogeneity of perspectives and how her lived experience allows her to acknowledge a need for improvement based on her experience of “other” and “abjection” via her son’s “invisible disability”. It also implied that Settler experiences are not as racialized and do not allow for full acknowledgement of indigenous difference and indigenous self-determination that will be further explored in the next section. Kate (Settler) is able to find a sense of belonging and a sense of community almost immediately, her son with special needs and her whole family are accepted into the Settler community in Whitehorse.

Yeah. I have even had people just be more open to saying, yeah grocery shopping is hard I will go with you’, or ‘come to my house, I don’t care what you bring’. They have been really kind in that way and that is what is really unique about here is I appreciate that people don’t try and diagnose him further but just offer support.

Her experience implies a form of settler privilege, the generative capacity to uproot and relocate one’s family to receive necessary social services.

Professionally skilled Settler women who also participated in this case study responses demonstrate the privilege their positions afford them, and it could be seen to influence their perceptions and experiences of citizenship. For example, Marguerite (Settler)
perceives citizenship through the lens of her lived experience, one that gives her the opportunity to be an active citizen who participates and is engaged in her community. For her,

to participate in citizenship, you have to be active. You have to engage in a community. You have to engage with others. You have to be interested. You know there is some responsibly that goes with citizenship and…it is a part of building community…then it extends even beyond that because you have citizenship at sort of the micro level and then you have it at the bigger picture. So, when you do acts of citizenship in this group here it actually extends out to the bigger territory, to country wide.

This perception of citizenship involves a level of agency not only at the micro level but also at the meso and macro levels not always accessible to the Indigenous women who also participated in this case study. As Marguerite’s (Settler) comments above reveal whose knowledge counts, whose lived experiences is framing the dialogue. There appears to be a need for further un/decolonizing of education in the territory and how knowledge is transmitted and shared, as the spaces and places Settlers occupy continue to be influenced by effects of the colonial mechanism of normalizing Canadian society. These mechanisms continued to be utilized ‘to disappear’, through assimilative legislation and acculturation practices, Indigenous women as they have for generations through the discrimination of the dominant hegemony. Throughout all the interviews with the professional Settler participants, I observe and noted some struggled more than other, yet all wanted to be seen to be doing or saying the ‘right’ thing. There are even a few moments of unstated underlying unarticulated racism in what one Indigenous participant called the “thinly veiled ‘white saviour’ complex” of some professional white women. The notion Settlers have done “so much” or “all we can” and why is it “never enough” or why doesn’t it give us full access or participation are the two predominate sentiments expressed. These notions show there is still work to do to continue to un/decolonizing to build empathy and an understanding that some things are not for Settlers, period.

Unlike the BC case, in the Yukon case Indigenous participants are not homogenous, not all members of one Nation; however, they are all connected to the CSO and/or Kwanlin Dün through Dusk’a. Therefore, although similarities exist among and across Indigenous participants their lived experience of social citizenship is not only grounded in the space and place of this traditional territory it is also nested within each individual kin group’s worldview. For example, Jolene (Indigenous) belongs to both her home community of Teslin
but also to Kwanlin Dün, and it becomes more complex and nested, for as Jolene (Indigenous) explains,

There is still lots of work to be done on the land claims and stuff. See what I am stuck in it right now as I am a Kwanlin Dün member, but I am not a citizen because I belong to a different Band. See I belong to Teslin Band, and I belong to Kwanlin Dün. So, I have got no benefits from Kwanlin Dün. I am not a beneficiary as I am a Teslin beneficiary, but I am a Kwanlin Dün member, so I am stuck in the middle.

For Jolene (Indigenous), her sense of belonging is tied not just to where she is from but where she lives, to who gives her a relational space of reciprocity. As she further explains,

I don’t get no benefits; I get nothing from Teslin. Kwanlin Dün does everything for me. They house me, they give me what I need, and Teslin doesn’t do anything for me unless I leave Kwanlin Dün…But Kwanlin Dün doesn’t do that, they help everyone everywhere. They could live in Vancouver. They could live in Halifax. They could live in Montreal. Anywhere, and Kwanlin Dün will help them.

Jolene’s (Indigenous) perception implies that the lived experience of social citizenship for Indigenous people is impacted, and not always positively, at the meso level because of the land settlement agreements. As Alcantara (2013) argues, the Kwanlin Dün First Nation historically focused on negotiations and collaborative co-existence not only with the Crown but also with surrounding Indigenous Nations. It links back to precontact and continues to influence interactions, shared space, and resources of moieties and this in turn influences the negotiations and implementation of the land settlement agreements.

Jolene (Indigenous) expands further by linking this sense of citizenship as belonging to the notion of “security”, shifting the sense of belonging from kin, places of relational reciprocity, to include the meso and macro layers of citizenship because of ongoing integration and interactions with the Settler population.

Citizenship is security. Knowing that you have a place in the community. If you are Canadian, you know, you have more freedom and more rights then going over to South Africa or Israel or someplace where all the war is happening. Canada is such a safe place to live. You are fortunate to be a Canadian. Like the community too, I wasn’t Kwanlin Dün I wouldn’t have a home, I wouldn’t have security.
These shifts in perceptions create nested notions of the experience of citizenship that imply an individual is ‘in relation’, a part of something bigger. These layers of belonging imply also that a citizen’s sense of belonging can have multiple meanings simultaneously. Similarly, Stacey’s (Indigenous) perception of citizenship as belonging is nested,

I think it means belonging. Belonging to something or some group. I believe I have citizenship in a number of hats. To start of I am a citizen of my family, I believe I am a citizen of my First Nation, I am a Tr’ondek Hwechin citizen and then I am citizen of the Yukon and a citizen of Canada, and then I am a global citizen as well. Like I belong to this world and I kind of look at it as different areas of citizenship and not just…I believe I am a citizen in all aspects of my life and so citizenship to me is just about belonging to a group.

These perceptions also suggest a level of acculturation due to this mixing and perhaps the argument can be made for the urbanization through proximity to the capital of Whitehorse. It hints at something I noted it my field notes: the notion of self in relation nested within the notion of the collective in relation and how it is link to the notion of being “of the land”. Coulthard (2014) demonstrates the question of land, the struggle for it, is not just material but intrinsically spiritual one informed by the hegemony of Indigenous ontologies and epistemologies that intersect and integrate into a range of dimension expressed though languages, ceremonies, protocols, and laws of the land. In the spaces and places of this case study, they also include an interconnectedness, belonging in relation through respectful reciprocity and responsibilities. Jolene’s (Indigenous) words could also denote the Fanonian notion of the colonized subject, or a view of nested citizenship found within the perceived “security” being Canadian provides; it is as Coulthard argues these types of complex social interactions can have both positive and negative effects on an individual’s agency.

Participants’ perceptions of citizenship as belonging on the one hand speaks to the desire of Settlers to belong, to be part of the space and place they occupy; however on the other hand highlights the lack of Settler understanding of the full impact of colonialism on Indigenous peoples sense of belonging which is intrinsically for those interviewed in the Yukon tied to kin and land, the relational connection to “all my relations”, or the local notion of: “We don’t own the land; we are the land”.

Interconnected with the notion of citizenship as belonging, as constructed in case one, is the concept of citizenship as relational. Citizenship as relational is thus found in the concept of “being of”, of being accountable and responsible, of being in a social relationship with the land and others grounded in individual and collective ontology, epistemology,
axiology, and methodology. Lowman and Barker (2015) argue the crucial difference between Indigenous and Settler citizens is their relationship to the land and the value it has in how it shapes their worldviews and concepts of self in relation, their relational sense of belonging. It is more than simply being ‘a part of’, it is to be relationally responsible and accountable to all those you take part with and to the space and place where you take part.

Settler perspectives on land are centred on coming, conquering, and creating a sense of community. For Marie (Settler), citizenship is perceived relationally as getting involved, using your voice, and giving what you can, what you are capable of. It is about, being part of your community and … I mean yeah being a … giving back what you can, being part of what you can in your community. And I think speaking up and saying something whether it is good or bad is also almost part of your responsibility as a citizen.

Her views of the notions of community, the relational, and using your voice in a good way, responsibilities, implies the necessity to look at citizenship as also a series of relational responsibilities influenced by participants ontological, axiological, methodological, and epistemological stances. This is alluded to in Rachel’s (Settler) description of the Yukon as she thinks, “the community in Yukon is really unique to many… compared to many parts of Canada”. From the perspective of citizenship as relational, her experience and perception of the Yukon also highlights the perceived relational reciprocity of this space and place articulated by all participants. The physical landscape, terrain, geography, and weather are observed to influence directly the sense of “welcoming” and of the willingness to help others to “all survive the winter”.

Further to this is the analysis of Settler acknowledgement of the influence of land settlement and self-government agreements on the lived experience of social citizenship in the territory and at the sites of investigation. For example, Alayne’s (Settler) notion of citizenship as belonging is based on her axiological, ontological, and epistemological perspectives of equality and access. She sees caution in my reflection that there is hope, hope that there is another way of doing things, that we can do things differently, and that the Yukon case study could be used as an example of how to. She cautions taking ideas from this space and place for as she says,

I do think Yukon is unique though. I don’t think you can … it would be interesting to me to see if you thought there is something from here that you could take and plunk it somewhere else because it is so different here. Some of the things are the same, definitely you are fighting the same perceptions,
people are facing the same struggles. I think the Land Claims made a huge difference.

Alayne’s (Settler) interpretation of the difference the land claims made is directly related to the resulting shifts in service delivery and jurisdiction that from her perspective enable her to secure long term funding and relationships (i.e., partnership with Kwanlin Dün). Alayne (Settler) also speaks about how the land settlements and self-government agreements in combination with the proximity in Whitehorse of Settlers and Indigenous peoples/communities as well as the access to government(s) all influences these relationships and opportunities for participation, partnership, and power sharing.

We work in a small place; I think for First Nations, it is the same, they have more direct connection… you live in the same place, you do the same things, know the same people. I just think it is a little bit easier to create those partnerships and relationships because of proximity.

Douglas (Settler) also provides insights based on his experiences of the relationships between Indigenous and Settler citizens in the territory and of the impacts of signing the land settlement and self-government agreements by first pointing out the importance of understanding the sociohistorical context of the Yukon, during the gold rush period, Indian Residential School era, and the building of the Alaska Highway. He argues this sociohistorical context needs to be considered when highlighting the positive impacts and how some of the peoples who have signed the agreements have been perceived to be more progressive and successful as they participated, secured these partnerships with the Crown, and are perceived to share power now via land settlement and self-government agreements. Douglas (Settler) relays in his story that “he knows this” because of the relationships he has formed in the process. His sharing and lived experience highlight the changing Settler attitudes the land settlement claims process claims to have fostered. As the representative to the Crown in the Yukon, Douglas (Settler) infers that the biggest benefit is the re-emergence of languages and cultures in the territory, the drummers, dancers, artists, and storytellers. “A sense of pride in who you are.” There is a sense of pride and self-confidence. However, there persists the illusion of the mythology of the north alluded to at the beginning of this dissertation and many people still come to the Yukon to solely make money and leave. Douglas (Settler) perceives a fundamental difference between these types of citizens and the “First Nations who have always been here and continue to remain close to the land” and he feels that more so now that “people come and are staying for generations”. His reflections imply relationships are not finite or solely defined by legislation and agreements, but also by
actions and interactions in spaces and places where we “do citizenship” and enact sovereignty. Thus, citizenship as relational is enacted, embodied, and emplaced through the social actions, processes, and practices of citizens.

The caution here is Douglas’ (Settler) lived experience is settler-centric and entrenched within the colonial constitutional order because of his professional roles. However as suggested in his narrative, his interactions, and his relationships with Indigenous people lead him to see “self-determination as key”. Palmater clearly articulates for true self-determination to happen, “our Indigenous identity must be clearly and completely within our own hands – no more legislative control over who we are” (2015:50). Douglas (Settler) also feels that Yukoners learn from their mistakes and the territory has become more inclusive; he also feels,

First Nations governments are more successful and continually learn from each other as there have been huge changes over the last 10 years as there is more capacity than there was in the first 20 years of the agreements. There have also been changes in the relationship between First Nations leaders and government or governmental departments and how things have improved, including the involvement of more women.

However, he is also quick to point out that the process was not easy, and it is still not always easy,

relationship take work, hard work but they are working through the challenges including any number of current agreements as well as the next phase of the current settlement. In particular, when talking about ‘who’ has control over what; often times it comes down to the court to decide. The understanding is now government to government versus government to communities under the Indian Act.

The perception here is that these agreements of self-government will be implemented and mitigate abjection; this will take time to determine if this is so or if it is as Coulthard argues these types of policies are thinly veiled continued colonial logics.

For all the Indigenous participants in this case, relational reciprocity is grounded in the land occupied by ancestors, but also in the relationships formed on the land prior to and since contact, and therefore requires as Fleras and Maaka (2010) argue relational yet autonomous governance relationships. Wanda, (Indigenous) an Elder from a southern nation who has lived in the community of both Whitehorse and Kwanlin Dün for more than 50 years, speaks about how the relational aspects of citizenship from her perspective are more
apparent when she worked in the old village. She “thought that in the old village people were closer, closer knit...helped each other”. Again, present here is the notion of relational responsibility influenced by ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing but also linked to the social relationship with the land. Re-problematicizing the context as continued settler colonialism allows me to centre counter narratives of the land settlement and self-government agreement processes and practices and how these contested tools of public policy are perceived as requiring compromises. As Erin (Indigenous) puts it, “yep, I think that happened to a lot of First Nations in Canada that we didn’t get the areas that they originally had”.

Despite the oral and historical evidence that the land in the Yukon is unceded and so integral to self in relation, in these processes land is “ceded, released, and surrendered in order to share permanent jurisdiction over some of their lands with the federal, territory, and municipal governments” (Alcantara, 2013: 102).

Despite the disconnection and loss of the sense of belonging this dispossession of land creates, in particular the relocation of the villages impact on Elders. For Wanda (Indigenous) citizenship is about the place and the connection to the land, responsibility to the community, and to the other citizens around you. For her, citizenship doesn’t mean anything to anybody unless you were born and came from a certain place...When you are a citizen here, unless you are a pretty special person, I don’t think citizenship means diddley squat. But people like me, I have done a good job in my work, I am helpful, I am a caring person, I love everybody, even the good bad and the ugly, they are all there. I don’t have any problem with that because my mother was a half-breed, half Chinese half Indian. She always says that everyone has a story. So, if you listen to that story then that is how you get your citizenship by listening to the stories. You know that, yeah, I deserve to be a citizen, and a good one and if you can’t be a good one and follow ways of the rest of the citizens then don’t try and be a citizen, just get gone. Go and isolate yourself if that is what you want.

Implied in Wanda’s (Indigenous) phrasing is the notion of her relational reciprocity, responsibilities, or obligations for maintaining respect and relationships within not only the space and place of her birth but also in the space and place she lives and practices her indigeneity or citizenship in relation. Generational knowledge is passed down in the stories of kin and relations that contain within them the lived and practices or the social aspects of how to be “a good one”. Stories will shape us according to who we are and for those that are not willing to act relationally accountable and responsible, Wanda (Indigenous) says “get gone”.
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A strong clear message of where to find the tools to develop one’s citizenship as relational: to sit, listen, and learn from each other’s stories, the formal told in ceremony and the informal in relation. The connection to the land is also highlighted in Wanda’s (Indigenous) story of her granddaughter and how being on the land reconnects her and gives her a sense of space and place.

It is like my granddaughter coming home from school... She gets grounded, she is on the land. She will go outside, and she will say, ‘grandma, I just want to sit out here, I just want to look around, I just want smell it’. Again, inferred here is the role of place, of being “grounded” in the land as a way to express self in relation; citizenship as a relational connection to the land itself expressed in the language and lived and practiced indigeneity of knowledge production.

Also, as a result of the socio-historical context and colonial legacies of dispossession and assimilation, the Yukon has a diverse demographic that is multicultural but as Lyndsay (Indigenous) puts it,

it is very close knit…like a big, huge community of people who really care about each other. We love to support each other, whether we know you or not. (laughter) You know the winters can be hard but again that just brings us closer to our families. It creates that stronger bond.

Her perception of role in space and place, of the land, in shaping social relations highlights her Indigenous worldview of the axiological importance of the interconnectedness and interrelatedness with the land in her epistemological and ontological perceptions of the relational and reciprocal environment it creates. Similarly, Stacey (Indigenous) also perceives the Yukon to be a “welcoming place” and “very multicultural” and feels “there is less racism”. Further in the conversation, she is more self-reflective stating,

I am First Nations, but I believe that I have white privilege in the sense that I look white, and people assume I am white until I tell them that I am First Nations. When I do that, they are like, oh yeah you are not that much. So, I am just like ok whatever (laughter). So, I feel like I haven’t experienced too much racism here in the Yukon.

Humour is a tool Stacey (Indigenous) uses to deflect discrimination normalized through continued settler colonialism. Interestingly she did not view these micro aggressions regarding “how much” Indigenous she is as racist and could be perceived as an example of how external laws create divisions, misunderstandings, and influence collective and individual well-being and perceptions of others and self.
For Amber (Indigenous) citizenship is about a sense of belonging about relations and responsibilities. It also about a sense of interconnected relational experiences grounded in place, tied to the territory and to the land of her husband and the family she is now accepted into for whom she has relational responsibility.

Live how you want and treat the land right which is something me and my husband are completely for… we teach traditional dancing, and it is interesting because when you walk into that situation not everyone is from the clans, not everyone is First Nations. So, my husband has made it a point to say ‘no, you are part of my family; I don’t care what anyone else says when you dance with me you are part of my family and I share this with you’…I find that those barriers kind of melt away.

Despite all the barrier externally imposed as a result of legislated discrimination inherent within the colonial legacies of Canada and designed to divide not only Indigenous Nations internally and between each other but also Indigenous and Settler citizens. Amber (Indigenous) and her husband welcome all who “are willing to take the time to learn”, to take part in ceremony, to dance, to enact sovereignty on the land.

As Horne, an Indigenous MLA in the Yukon, argues the land settlement agreements are a step towards devolution, of returning the rights Canada divested from Indigenous people and this requires, “community education and citizen involvement” (2010:3). For, as Palmater states, “all of these external laws create divisions, inequities, and injustice that focus our attention on our externally imposed identities” (2015:47). Perhaps the argument can be made that the land settlement agreements in the Yukon provide the space and place for Indigenous citizens to express their own indigeneity and political voices by removing the legislated control of the Indian Act 1876 (“on the day of signing a self-governing agreement, the Indian Band ceases to exist and is succeeded by a self-governing Yukon First Nations” INAC,2008:9). It is about acknowledging that the Indigenous governance, laws, ceremonies, traditions, protocols, trade systems, and networks existing prior to Settlers’ arrival are complex, rich, and tied to traditional territories as reflected in the languages, cultures, ideologies, ways of being, and ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. By doing so, the inference is that it opens up spaces and places for true connection, learning, understanding and potentially reconciliation. An example of land as a social relation and as reclaimed spaces and places of agency and the assertion of political voice, as seen in the everyday lived experience of citizenship that challenges perceptions and creates counter hegemonic
narratives of indigeneity and Indigenous-Settler relations as seen in Kwanlin Dün and Whitehorse based narratives.

The Settler narrative of the Yukon, of ‘the North’, creates both real and imagined spaces and perceptions that often ignored how these spaces are appropriated, how histories and ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing are interrupted and forever transformed. Rachel’s (Settler) description of the Yukon could be seen as an example of how a Settler’s lived experience influences her narrative.

It is a fabulous place to live and a fabulous place to raise a family…is a really vibrant community of people who are not from here; not born and raised. I think that really forces you to find your own community and build your own community and not just rely on family because you have and at the same time there is a juxtapose of people who have been here forever and who have a huge sense of community and a huge sense of family. I think somehow that dynamic just works and it a great place to live. Our challenges in terms of isolation are a gift to us because things can be done differently here than they are done in the rest of the world.

Her juxtaposition of these two communities implies that “it just works” and doesn’t fully acknowledge true lived experiences of the “people who have been here forever” and implies a transformation of the narrative to one of settler certainty even post land settlement agreements. This settler certainty does not always align with the lived experience of Indigenous people in the same space and place. When Kona (Indigenous) is asked to describe the Yukon, she states,

friendly, helpful…Like we enjoy a lot of service here, we really do. You know, coming here in 2005 compared to Saskatchewan I’d say relations between First Nations and the regular, you know, mainstream population is better. It is a lot better than it is in Saskatchewan.

Interesting is her use of “regular” as another discursive example of internalized colonialism. She describes “mainstream” this way which implies she constructs and internalizes First Nations are not, are outside of, not a part of, perhaps ‘irregular’, or abject. However, she goes on to further disclose that when she first moved from Saskatchewan to the Yukon, she is warned not to let people know she was Indigenous. Kona (Indigenous) is told,

… ‘you probably just don’t want to tell everyone you are First Nations’… I was like, hmm, and was kind of like ‘hmm, ok’ and I guess she probably being blond hair white girl probably hears things that we as First Nations people
don’t hear. Right? So, she felt that there was tension. Right? That there is
tension between like government workers, and all the political games you have
to play that you are in those professional roles. So, she probably had some
insight. But I have never really, I’ve never really felt…I’ve never felt like not
a part of the group like I have in Saskatchewan.

Kona’s (Indigenous) counter narrative, her sense of belonging implies an experience of
welcoming even though she has no kin connection to the land and people. However, it also
speaks again to how the space and place is more racist than it initially appeared.

Citizenship as belonging also takes the form in this case of citizenship as spirituality. In
this case it is constructed as linked to the relational interconnectedness with the land and
all living things, is space- or place-based or specific, and is nested within the narratives and
counter narratives of whose knowledge counts and whose ways of knowing, doing,
perceiving, and valuing are centred. Settler certainty transformation within constructed
narrative and counter narratives of this now shared space also implies differences in
worldview as they do not consider the spiritual dimension of citizenship that is inherent
within the Indigenous ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing that are
interconnected, holistic, spiritual, and guided by languages and stories (Fleras & Maaka,
2010, 2005). As stated before, the Indigenous participants in this case reflect the composition
of the space and place as some are from here but many are from elsewhere. Kwanlin Dün as
well as other constructions of spirituality are expressed and inform participants worldview
and thus perceptions and concepts of citizenship; however, in this case, the commonality is
the relational interconnectedness and interrelatedness with the land. Kona (Indigenous) for
example articulated it as a sense of “connection” and “who are you, and where are you from”.
However, due to acculturation, because her mother was (dis)enfranchised under the Indian
Act 1876 when she married a Settler, Kona (Indigenous) feels “we are not really connected to
the reserve at all”. In her own words, this is a result of the Indian Act, her mother
was not allowed to go to the reserve anymore and um yeah…So, we grew up
away from the reserve and there is hurt feelings... So, she really wanted us to
have nothing to do First Nations and First Nations people.

Her lived experience makes clear the effects of the Indian Act on her mother’s connection to
her community, her own connection, and her children’s connection demonstrating the
intergenerational impacts of the colonial legacy in Canada that these assimilative legislations
continue to have. It also highlights how the subjectivities of nested experiences colour the
perceptions of her sense of belonging. She goes on further to say that the result in her
community is, “families become disconnected from each other and their communities and their culture”. However, after having the opportunity to work with her community, to reconnect her mother with family, Kona (Indigenous) now feels “so connected to my reserve….and I wonder if my kids are going to have….a similar connection”. The exclusion and alienation she felt/feels from her mother’s people is being healed through re-established relational connectedness and the chance “to connect to my reserve”, to the land. Again, it highlights a potential spiritual nature of citizenship through the connection to the land, to space and place, to kin, a continual temporal connection that is regenerated within the resilient agency of Indigenous women.

On the other hand, Barb’s (Indigenous) experience of the intergenerational trauma as a result of the macro level legislation leaves her unwilling to trust anyone with her daughter’s care without her being present and involved.

Cameras is the first thing (laughter). I was trying to think of last night if there were any way I could have a little mobile camera I could put in a room and I could watch it on my phone because that is just how paranoid I am as a parent. She is quick to reassure me that her father did not go to Indian Residential School and was able to guide the parenting and skill development of her and her siblings even though her mother is a survivor. For her, she says she was taught to “speak from my soul, to let my spirit speak” and that,

you respect your Elders, and you give them food first, but everything else kids come before anything. Kids come before television, they come before drinking, they come before smoking, they come before driving down the road to the store, they come before everyone.

Her perception of others’ experience of intergenerational trauma is also one of fear and lack of trust, particularly of parenting skills development,

especially First Nations communities, were they have that Residential school effect. Where the parents don’t stand up and participate… That is what you need because they do not have that because they have the parents at home who are drinking and hiding their feelings and hiding their emotions and hiding their understanding of the world away from these youth who are growing up into individuals who don’t know how to do these things… no one is giving her the practical intelligence she needs.

Her perceptions of the impacts of the legacies of colonialism and the continuation of the impact of intergenerational trauma implies that there is nothing “post” about colonialism for
Barb (Indigenous). The intergenerational trauma creates a disconnection to the spiritual, to the sense of belonging and connection to the land and language and culture, the protocols, and practices, of citizenship are not passed down via the traditional matriarchical kinship system predominate among the Indigenous people of what is now the Yukon territory. However again the nested lived experience of Indigenous women can be gleaned also in Barb’s (Indigenous) resiliency and agency, the continued connection to the land, to citizenship as spirituality. This is implied in her response to how she would ground her own child to ensure she is acting in a “good way”, for as she claims, if my child ever did something and then whatever it was, the example was took off drinking or took off from school or wasn’t attending or went and robbed some place. I would personally take her into the bush for however many months, not weeks, as necessary. Even if it neglected her practical intelligence and even if it neglected her social experience to be able to ground her again.

Inferred here is the concept of the importance of the role of place, of the land in the spiritual wellness that for Barb (Indigenous) ensures the acts of citizenship are grounded in a “good way”. The connection, or disconnection, due to continued settler colonialism is rooted in her social and political position as an Indigenous citizen in her lived, practiced, and relational indigeneity as a practical way to mitigate the impacts of persistent epistemic violence with Indigenous axiological, epistemological, and ontological knowledge production on the land. Barb’s (Indigenous) comments and commitment to fostering her daughter’s connection to the land, her ontological right, as foremost in epistemological and axiological development also suggests a relational accountability rooted in place connected to the land and the knowledge production that occurs between the spiritual, the self, and the land (see Greenwood and De Leeuw 2006).

Amber’s (Indigenous) story highlights another example of epistemic violence experienced via the disconnection to citizenship as spirituality, agency as reliance, and relational acceptance and accountability. She originally comes from California and is adopted into a non-Indigenous family. As an Indigenous woman her lived experience there is one, she expresses as, So, its an odd place because I was brought up…well the rest of my family is blond hair green eyed. So, growing up there was a very big divide between people I went to school with... Then I have my mom’s side of the family who was like ‘no, you’re white because you act like this, you think like us, you do
things this way; you don’t go to the community that they do, you are way over here’. So, it was kind of like being torn in half... [That although] I came from the land of dreams and I am telling you this would be my land of dreams because when I first came up here, I had ...I had no real sense of identity in any family. Like I grew up very much, I raised myself through my life. So, coming up here and being with aunties, and grandmas, and Elders, and huge matriarchical family members.

Amber’s (Indigenous) self narrative speaks to her multiple experiences as a female Indigenous citizen of two states, one where she feels a sense of disconnection, of the impact of macro and micro level decisions that left her feeling “torn apart” to one of inclusion and connection within her husband’s family and moiety. Again, her example demonstrates the continued epistemic violence experienced by many Indigenous women and children as a result of the colonial logics and material interventions as well as an example of her agency and resiliency that led her to venture to a space and place that welcomed “others” both historically and currently. Amber (Indigenous) is married into the Ta’an Kwäch’än community. For her, this sense of inclusion, of belonging, of learning from aunties and grandmothers, connects her to the place, and being a citizen of “here” as she puts it now means for Amber (Indigenous) that it’s about, it’s coming here and saying this is who I am, and I am going to be vulnerable and join the arena of people who are standing out there and just …doing what you do loudly (laughter) without bothering other people.

Amber’s (Indigenous) lived experiences of social citizenship suggests how a sense of belonging and connection to place can create a sense of citizenship that for her is a spiritual interconnection and relational experience grounded in the place, the language, and the practices of the people of her husband’s land. Although these lived experiences can be argued to be social, what is important here is that for these Indigenous women they are also relational and spiritual.

Another example of the citizenship as spiritual is found in Jolene’s (Indigenous) notion of “security” as it goes beyond the sense of belonging discussed early, and for her embodies an element of the spiritual through cultural practices enacted, embodied, and emplaced within the potlatch house. As well as how the community is purposefully laid out when the relocated happened so that it reflects the traditional lay out of the original community.
Yes. We have our potlatch house where we have potlatches and funerals... See that is our...that is what our citizenship involves all of that as it brings a sense of security knowing that you belong to something. It is just like belonging to an organization where you have the benefits. If you work in a job and you get the benefits of your security in your job, plus the union so you know you are secure, that is the same sense that you have when belong to a band or community. It is in a sense laid out like this. Her words imply a mixing or nesting of her perceptions of citizenship, from spiritual inherent within the cultural practices and spaces, to the benefits and rights of citizenship, creating security, and finally the purposefulness of how both the community itself but also citizenship is laid out with nested purposes and places. However, these relocations are perceived in the lived experience of participants to be both positive and negative. Rebuilding of cultural spaces for socio-political and ceremonial or spiritual practices are perceived as positive. The counter narrative of Elders’ disconnection to the land that is linked to depression, addiction, and Elder abuse will be explored in further in section 6.5.3.

In Kwanlin Dün, and with all of my participants, I made an offering to start every interaction, and offering of sage bundled in the cloth of the four colours of the medicine wheel, yellow, red, back, and white. These sage ties were well received and many of the Indigenous participants commented on my making space for Indigenous practices. It was shared with me that Kwanlin Dün meetings, community events, and interpersonal interactions need to begin according to protocol with some combination of song, blessing, and ceremony, as well as an acknowledgement of the land. For example, the Nâkwât’a Kù Potlatch House mission statement is,

an important asset of the Kwanlin Dün First Nation. It holds a prominent place in the community and represents a commitment to the Nation to return to the traditional laws and cultural practices. Nâkwât’a Kù hosts many events and community functions in a manner that promotes and represents community pride and ownership…Nâkwât’a Kù in Southern Tutchone means “Ceremony House” and signifies a commitment to the community to return to the use of traditional laws and cultural practices. Traditional laws, practices and customs must be followed inside the hall, at the fire pit and the grounds surrounding the building (KDFN website).

My limited relational and epistemological understanding of the importance of this sacred space is limited by my lack of language skills, limited experiences of what I am given.
permission to witness, and what is shared with me. In this case, I am truly an outsider and based on this acknowledgement, the spiritual praxis of this sacred space is understood in accordance with the relational nature of the moieties and clans, the communities, interconnectedness as a place to gather socially, politically, and spiritually.

Similarly with the first case, participants’ perceptions of these abstractions and actualizations of the spiritual aspects of their lived experience of social citizenship, of what it means to be a Kwanlin Dün citizen in this newly constructed community, ensures actions carried out are grounded in cultural ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. These spiritual aspects and practices are their right as citizens, a right that was illegal for years under the Indian Act. Again, citizenship as spirituality is as Lincoln and Guba (2000) reminds us about the axiological roots of these spiritual aspects of citizenship, the processes, practices, and protocols. In this case they are tied not only to the land but to a specific “sacred space” of the potlatch house, a space where the spiritual meets the social, one where citizenship is being freed from the previous oppression; again, this is considered to be “a profoundly spiritual concern” (p.169). There is an underlying continuity of notions for these women of the spiritual interrelatedness of how all things are interconnected, spiritually connected to the land, water and animals, and transfers to perceptions of Indigenous citizenship as interconnection, as spirituality but also as space or place specific.

The politics of knowledge production, as Hunt (2013) argues links ontology with indigeneity and ground epistemological and axiological ways of knowing and doing situated in specific spaces and places in lived, practiced, and relational experiences of social citizenship knowledge production. These experiences are often situated within the socio historic and political realities of problematized context of continued settler colonialism and strategies of epistemic violence that are juxtaposed with narratives of resilience and agency often through a spiritual (re)connection that is in-relation and space or place-specific. Imposed colonial ideologies and practices do not consider the above spiritual, or interconnected, view of citizenship to be a part of the dialogue. The next section explores the CSOs agency and knowledge production at the sites of research.

6.4 CSO as agent: the thinking and doing of social citizenship ~ the art of a culturally responsive and relational partnership

As Fleras and Maaka argue “power-sharing” can initiate “transformational change” when “the politics of indigenous difference transcend the limitations of institutional reform” (2010:15). In this case I argue, legislative power-sharing leads to further participation and partnership between Indigenous and Settler individuals, groups, organizations, and
communities. These are also seen as foundational principles at the YCDC and Dusk’a and are perceived to lead to the creation of shared space and shared experiences or stories. Stories that are about the development relational responsibility and cultural responsiveness advocacy and the notion of working with through intercultural professionalism. Shifts in axiological praxis and relationships are attributed by participants to the land settlement agreement and the over 20 plus year partnership. Both create a safe space over time for those abjectified to have their knowledge count, to have their ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing enacted, embodied, and emplaced as social action that reduces barriers between Indigenous and Settler citizens in the Yukon. As well as the creation of counter narratives of the marginalizing of some through overly professionalized communication, others share the lived experience of engaging continually in un/decolonizing of both space and practices while experiencing continued settler colonial logics that privilege and abject.

The notion of the partnership between YCDC and Dusk’a as being one of fostering participation and power sharing in the joint delivery of child services is inferred from participants’ lived experiences and their perceptions. This section will explore the YCDC axiological enactment of the organization’s values of respect, trust, honesty, and compassion as a perceived cross-cultural bridge that enables self in relation and self as part of collective in inclusive family centred spaces and in partnership with indigenized spaces. This enables the exploration participants’ perceptions of the alignment, or not, between the YCDC rhetoric and social actions. Participants acknowledge that these CSOs are family centred and see the professional privilege of many of the Settler staff at the YCDC as both a benefit and communication hurdle. All perceive the YCDC as universally culturally competent and a space of inclusion, critiques are raised about communication, increased services, and increased active un-colonizing and decolonization of the entire organization. Next, I will highlight how knowledge production, space, and place also play roles in CSO as agent. The YCDC is both in community and in proximity to Whitehorse and to Kwanlin Dün. This allows for sharing a space and place that plays a role in the YCDC’s ability and capacity to be in the community and to be culturally responsive and responsive to families needs. As Alayne (Settler) shares,

One of the things we did was our office up in Kwanlin Dün. It was one of the best things we ever did as far as being able to be in the community and have people come to us and feel good about that and to want to come. I mean there is always that struggle, and I am sure Margarette has been meeting families all the time that are unsure.
Acknowledging the role of trust and continued uncertainty provides space and place for lived experiences that intersect with predominately Settler child welfare institutions like YCDC. This can be inferred as evidence of the enactment of the values of trust, honesty, respect, and compassion and in acknowledging Indigenous worldviews and the influence of the socio-historical context of Yukon.

Douglas (Settler) indicates that social service delivery has greatly improved over the last 20 years. From his perspective, since the land claims settlement social services delivery is “more drawn down”, from Whitehorse to each community within the Yukon. Many social service delivery agencies often have to be innovative or flexible to help meet the expectation of localized service delivery; he specifically cites the mobile vehicle of the YCDC as an example. The YCDC provides therapeutic outreach services via a mobile vehicle that allows for easy transportation of required equipment for home and remote community visits.

Douglas (Settler) also cites the examples of the difficulty in educational services delivery, especially in an area where there may only be three of four students, and how this leads to many youths having to relocate to a town, especially for grades ten, eleven, and twelve. He ties elements of the sociohistorical context within which the CSO delivers social services in the Yukon to the current influx of young professionals and federal government workers. This also reveals the real and perceived influences of government on social action. For Douglas (Settler), his lived experience of social citizenship leads to the perception that there is a shift from the negative impacts of colonialism, citing the Indian Residential School era, to the more positive impacts of the land settlement and self-government agreement process based on the relationship over the last 30 years between Settlers and Indigenous people. He cites the YCDC as an example of this shift in positive relations as perceived through their enacted values of respect, trust, honesty, and compassion, or in his words an organization that welcomed his grandchildren with open arms “based on the notions of total inclusion and non-discrimination”. These perceptions are shared by Sarah (Settler) who sees the role of YCDC as bridging the awareness for families on early childhood development. She perceives this role, like Douglas (Settler), as building empathy and safe spaces and places to educate children and families on whose knowledge counts in society and who is abjectified.

The YCDC plays a role in education other families too because you have a mix of families at the YCDC, right. Those that are maybe more marginalized and those who are not marginalized. They might not have a good understanding of what life looks like for those families but by mixing them
together in the centre they see the kids and they see the other parents and I think it can create better understanding and tolerance.

Sarah’s (Settler) perception implies these opportunities for knowledge exchange between ‘marginalized’ and ‘privileged’ children and families, citizens within a social context, happens between family and family and/or family and staff. These stories of transforming values into day-to-day action allows for an in-depth look at how the work of the YCDC impacts a marginalized population, that of children with special needs and their families. She also identifies that the YCDC’s values of ‘respect, trust, compassion, and honesty’ are translated into social action that reduces or breaks down barriers for their most marginalized families and children. These social actions include things like offering, bus service, the pickup. That is huge. So many families do not have a car. Offering to send therapist into the daycare. So, maybe parents can get the kid to daycare but to get the kid to the YCDC would be tough, so they send someone to the daycare. And they do home visits. It is that meeting people and not expecting everyone to just come to them...I know some families worked with when I worked for Kwanlin Dün’s Health service and that is how their kids got services and it was brilliant.

According to Rachel’s (Settler) perception of the role of relational responsibility not only in her role as a professional speech language pathologist (SLP), but also as a citizen shapes her lived experience of social citizenship within the space and place created by the YCDC. These perceptions of citizenship responsibilities, for her, are towards advocacy as relational responsiveness and responsibility as both a profession and citizen in general. Again, it could be inferred that this is another example of how the staff at the YCDC enacts organizational values into social actions. Sometimes the advocacy is a simple as reaffirming the parents’ knowledge, as Marie (Settler) experience initially is. She “just needed to talk to someone and tell me I was ok, and he was ok, and you know it was normal and all that”. This is also the perception of Kona (Indigenous), who “would like to see more people see them as this is a place we need to check in”. The relational responsiveness and relational responsibility of the centre is perceived by participants to be an asset at all levels, from the micro (family), meso (territorial/community), to the macro (Nation). This offers an example perhaps of how civil society organization are often spaces and places dominated by passionate women who are passionate about changing the lives of their fellow citizens through social action and social services. Rachel (Settler) identifies this enactment of organizational values into social action in,
one really clear example in our organization is when kids move from the YCDC to the school system, the school system is a really different place, where in YCDC I think it is more like a little family and we can do a lot with families, but I also think it is really important that we give them the skills that when they transition to the schools, they can advocate for themselves. I think that is important.

Parallel research as part of an interdisciplinary multi province team that explored autism and perceptions of autism services in rural and remote British Columbia and Alberta highlights transitions for children with disabilities are further exacerbated by the socio cultural and historical contexts that settler colonial logics create with regard to Indigenous families’ institutional mistrust and fear (Young, Nicholas, Chamberlain, Suapa, Gale & Bailey, 2018).

Transitions and mentoring to develop families’ advocacy skills is argued therefore to be another example of how the YCDC is culturally responsive in enacting its axiology as agent of social action. Hulme and Edwards argue that this type of ‘political advocacy’ fostered by CSOs allows for both the relational responsibility (or accountability) and participation that Rachel (Settler) identifies and maintains “both are part and parcel to a functioning democracy” (1997: 28).

Participants also infer the long-term partnership between the YCDC and Dusk’a builds understanding, empathy, and bridges between marginalized and privilege citizens through shared experiences in shared spaces. As Alayne (Settler) acknowledges there is a temporal component to undoing normalized perceptions of Settlers of Indigenous peoples and their experiences.

It was a challenge for me to come to really understand it and over the years I think I have come to have a good understanding of what happened and how that has affected, obviously not a first-hand knowledge, but definitely some. It is a struggle to get young people to really understand why that still persists in families that are young today. It is a real challenge.

Crowther (2000) argues perception plays a crucial role in any given situation that influences action. This is further inferred for the additional comment Alayne (Settler) makes in relation to how she acts and leads the organization, with young parents, they just don’t seem to realize that right away. It took me a long time, so I don’t expect people to get that right away, but it definitely has a huge impact with how we work with families and where families are at.
This notion of perceptions also connects to Sarah’s (Settler) comments above about how YCDC is inferred to be a space and place of inclusion particularly the partnership with Dusk’a. It also connects with the importance of the Board’s awareness of the socio-historic context and how it shapes relationships between Indigenous and non-Indigenous citizens; that even after 30 years of a land settlement agreement process these relationships can be inferred to have improved but the impacts of the continued colonial legacy are still very much a part of their everyday lived experience of social citizenship. Therefore, it is argued that indigenous difference in the partnerships, participation, and power sharing in social services delivery could be utilized to develop a shared understanding of our different lived experiences of social citizenship by continuing to build understanding and strengthen relationships through fostering indigeneity in axiological praxis.

Participants also identify the importance of meeting families where they are. The YCDC and the Dusk’a centre are perceived to be family centred and that their staff “they do what you say” while being flexibility and responsive. Also, by fostering indigeneity, as Greenwood and de Leeuw (2006) argue, by centring Indigenous ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing, the YCDC and Dusk’a are recognized to be addressing the previous colonial bias towards Indigenous families (single mothers and grandmothers). Erin (Indigenous), who has the dual role of being the manager of Dusk’a and a Board member of YCDC, observes the CSO being a bridge of intercultural professionalism. The partnership with the CSO is inferred to be another example of acknowledging and working with the community (or Nation) in order to mitigate the abject lived experience of social citizenship within the continued colonial context; and in this case implementing the land settlement agreement and the jurisdictional shifts of the self-governing agreement with regard to early childhood education. It could also be inferred as indigeneity and agency as the long-term relationship building and learning has enabled alternative knowledges to count and to be central.

Participants also imply that by establishing relative and relational autonomy within the Dusk’a centre over early childhood education allows families voices to be centred within the processes and practices of the centre. As Wanda (Indigenous) reflects, “as far as I am concerned the YCDC is the best thing that every happened anywhere and if we could have as many of the workers as they have downtown up here it would be wonderful”. The desire for increased services and increased localized capacity is always in tension with jurisdictional power and allocation of resources that as Douglas (Settler) points out is “a numbers game” when it comes to the politics of social services in Yukon. YCDC and Duska are argued to be
an example of a partnership based on shared power and participation that built understanding through shared practices, process, and lived experiences. Trust and compassion are seen to be key to building and maintaining this partnership. It also fosters a perception that the YCDC is working “with” the community and the families, that the role of space and place in social action, of physically being in the centre. As Marguerite (Settler) observes,

I am in this building, by virtue of the fact of being in this building I also have got the perception that there is a culture diversity here. I am perceived to be working for this organization or more closely with this organization… the perception is I work with.

Space and place can play an integral role in how social actions and services are perceived both positively and negatively, in this case positively but the perception of the space of the YCDC itself in the old Department of Education building still carries negative connotations for some Indigenous participants. It can also be inferred that the perceptions of the role of YCDC is linked to its space and place as it is seen as “governmental” instead of a stand-alone nonprofit society. Un/Decolonizing the space and place has the potential to disrupt colonial relations of power and allows for informal and confidential opportunities to enrich how vulnerabilities (i.e., children with special needs) are discussed.

On the other hand, the Dusk’a centre is grounded within the existing strength, resilience, social capital, and cultural capacity of the Indigenous knowledges of Kwanlin Dün. This capacity intersects with the infrastructural interventions of the land settlement agreement, self governing agreements, localized educational services, and cultural facilities (see Baptiste 2000 and Greenwood & de Leeuw, 2006). Jolene (Indigenous) views on un/decolonizing early childhood education spaces speaks to importance of localized services that are informal and confidential. Despite this progress towards un/decolonizing the space and place, Jolene (Indigenous) feels there needed to be more Indigenous involvement and Indigenous techniques used in the centre, in particular the need to incorporate more Elders, and to bring in more Native professionals. These calls for “inclusion” of Elders and of continuing to foster indigeneity within the space and place arise, as Young argues, from “experiences of exclusion” (2000:6). For Jolene (Indigenous), it becomes a question of whose knowledge counts or is inferred, and through which axiological, methodological, epistemological, and ontological lenses are the social actions legitimized. Her insight points to how fostering indigeneity and un/decolonizing space and place are two potential options for creating an “open concept”, a space and place “you are going to be comfortable going to”. St. Denis (2018) suggested this process of un/decolonizing educational spaces and places
requires cultural revitalization. This process can be seen in Wanda (Indigenous) observation that the exposure at Dusk’a to Indigenous languages and to indigenized space and place is argued to increase the degree to which a decision to foster indigeneity and un/decolonize space and places is normalized and legitimized. Again, as Young argues this can be related to the” degree to which those affected by it have been included in the decision-making processes and have the opportunity to influence the outcomes” (2000: 5-6).

CSOs like the YCDC are presented with the challenges and opportunities inherent in a desire for more services, a balancing act between quality and quantity. Many participants express insight into the need for more services, a bigger purposefully built centre not attached to the colonial legacy of the Education Department, better communication across services and among social service professionals across the territory, and more diversity amongst staff. In Kona’s (Indigenous) view “a bigger centre” would enable the YCDC to address, huge waiting list for that preschool and I would like to see them have a couple of those …a couple more classes. So that more kids can access, because well it is affordable. So, people that don’t have their kids in daycare still get that opportunity for the child to socialize before they go to school, and it is so invaluable for them to have that.

Throughout her sharing, Kona (Indigenous) expresses the perception that the YCDC was very conscious of removing barriers families may encounter from transportation, home visits, to inclusivity by inviting all to participate, not just Settler or Indigenous. The land settlement and self-government agreement process creates an environment where the YCDC is able to secure long term core funding that does not require segregation of services along race or ethnicity that often creates arbitrary silo-ing of services for children. Kona (Indigenous) reflects that the YCDC creates an environment where children with special needs are mixed in educational setting with kids without. This she shares “is so good for kids to just have that perception like especially with the amount of special needs kids that we have. Like everybody is just everybody. We need to just work together”. Fostering empathy for Amber (Indigenous) “is the first step…if you can see past your own story, I find that usually the first step into seeing someone else’s why’s or how’s or whatever they are doing”. It also creates spaces and places that are open, welcoming, and inclusive. This is reflected in Amber’s (Indigenous) experience with YCDC that is also nested in the relational foundation that her husband’s family provides. This set of values that promotes the inclusion of “people” into their family gets translated into how they experience the world, including their interactions with the YCDC. The family atmosphere fostered by YCDC’s organizational values of
respect, trust, honesty, and compassion create a perceived alignment with Amber’s (Indigenous) familial values creating an enriched experience in a respectful open space that is mindful to her families needs; as she says, “we took this journey with them”. This space and place of inclusion and the perception of working “with” is argued to be key to nurturing indigenous difference through partnership, participation, and power sharing as it has the potential to cultivates empathy and reciprocity. Chantelle (Indigenous) also remarks that her experience with YCDC at the Dusk’a centre is that it “was in the core of the community” and “really helpful in the community” reducing barriers to services (transportation and safety) and that “having it so close helped out a lot and I am really thankful for that”. Despite the reduction of barriers and an environment of inclusion there are still barriers for Chantelle (Indigenous) in accessing and fully participating in the services offered to her family.

I missed some of the stuff that happened though because we, I don’t have a cell phone. So, that is a really big…I will have to go and use someone else’s phone to figure out how my kids are doing and what is going on with them.

Although the YCDC’s perceived axiological enactment creates a space and place of inclusion, there are structural differences within society for participants like Chantelle (Indigenous) and the continued colonial logic means the structure of society continually constrains her power and agency. Lister argues “generative power” or participants agency to participate in power sharing opportunities can be constrained like Chantelle’s (Indigenous) “by the lack of material resources and power” (2014:127). Chantelle (Indigenous) and her children are not alone in having their agency constrained by the persistent structural inequities of continued settler colonialism as one in four Indigenous children live in poverty compared to one in ten Settler children (Palmater, 2015:8-9).

Further constraining to the CSOs agency is the perceived ‘professional speak’ or professional silo-ing which highlights how their heterogeneous approach to services is seen to fall short in communication, engaging other professionals, and un/decolonizing public engagement. As an early childhood education (ECE) worker herself who had been previously employed at Dusk’a, Lyndsay (Indigenous) feels that the YCDC staff could do a better job of communication and working with other professionals in territory, especially during outreach visits to other spaces and places beyond the YCDC and Dusk’a.

They kind of need to get to know one another because the YCDC are coming into a place that they are not at every single day, you know. I feel like there kind of needs to be a little bit more community which includes the ECE and the YCDC. They kind of need to work together in a respectful way so that they
are not feeling that way about each other. The YCDC is really focused on family, which is important but that is not the only people that they work with. Observations of those in the ECE field within the bounded space and place of this case study align with Lyndsay’s (Indigenous) experience that it could be generational and tied to limited local knowledge. As mentioned above young professionals are now the biggest influx into the territory and may not be aware of the socio historic context. Again, it is about the perception of a need for improved communication, or as she implies, reaching those hard to reach places, you know, because I know a lot of families who are just scared to bring up issues that they are having with their children. I feel like, especially people who have been affected by Indian Residential School, who have been in small communities and have moved to the big city, they are the ones who are the more reluctant ones to reach out for help. I feel it. The inference here can be linked to the almost instinctual observed mistrust of ‘institutions’, of spaces and places of ‘education’ as a result of the colonial legacy of Residential Schools. The intergenerational trauma hinted at speaks to the sense of belonging, or lack thereof, for those that are required to relocate for services (see below for further discussion of rurality and relocation), and how it impacts agency. The opportunity here is for the YCDC is go beyond its mandate, or as Choudry argues for, “organizations [to] meaningfully address colonial injustices against Indigenous Peoples” (2010:26), or as Lyndsay (Indigenous) states, “I feel like the YCDC has to reach out just a little bit more to kind of reach out for those people and take their hands and be like it is ok. We are here for you”. The inference here is a call to be continually improving cultural responsivity and un/decolonize services by rebuilding the trust in CSOs, especially those involved in education or literacy service delivery, through respectful, honest, and compassionate communication that acknowledges the multiplicity of worldviews and lived experiences.

Communication and professional speak or jargon also constrains Stacey’s (Indigenous) agency and perception of whose knowledge counts in the YCDC axiological praxis. Her experiences with the YCDC spurs her to advocate for “a transitional year” for “the YCDC to transition them and follow them for kindergarten. So, they work with the school, the Department of Education, and they kind of follow them”. For her, similarly to Lyndsay (Indigenous), it is about communication and whose knowledge counts. As the primary caregivers, participants argues that they are integral, as knowledgeable as any professional as it is their child; however, Stacey (Indigenous) acknowledges that not all
parents have the capacity, the agency, to advocate for their children. “It is parents that don’t know their educational rights for their child and because I am a teacher, I know my educational rights for my child, and I know my advocacy rights”. She also infers that this capacity has been impacted by the socio historic context, and how the colonial legacies interrupted the passing down of skills and knowledge for Indigenous parents. This interruption of or denial of self-determination, the injustices of the colonial legacy, are seen in what Young argues is the process or denial that led to “oppression [that] denies self-development” (2000:156). Stacey (Indigenous) suggests possible counter-hegemonic solutions that again call for the YCDC to go beyond its mandate, to un/decolonize, and address this colonial legacy by aiding in the self-development of the parents through mentoring and coaching by providing advocacy tools and workshops. This appears to be in alignment with Rachel’s (Settler) perceptions around the YCDC role with mentoring and advocacy, however, it is argued that the Indigenous participants want YCDC to continue to be relational and culturally responsive by centring families over professionals even within this aspect or within relationship and interactions. Kaplan argues this enables “people to participate in the governance of their own lives” and culturally differentiated priorities require responsiveness for “people centred development is about increasing, not decreasing choice” (2000:34-35).

Infrastructural interventions like land settlement agreements and self-governance agreements include educational jurisdiction that Greenwood and de Leeuw (2006) argue can foster indigeneity through (re)building cultural capacities and can also lead to increased participation in the north of Indigenous mothers in ECE programs. This participation suggests power sharing that leads to increases in self development, in skill acquisition, in competencies attainment, and in sense of self. Erin (Indigenous) shares how having the opportunity to not only manage Dusk’a but to also be a YCDC Board member results in, a lot of professional development from being on the Board just because of the way they organize themselves. They are very structured. I guess they have pretty intricate reporting requirements which in my job I look at all the finances and the financial reporting, staffing, and stuff like that so for me it was really interesting how they have their staff together…how they solve problems…[and] the selfless work they do.

The YCDC potential could become a more un/decolonizing space through the long-term partnership with Dusk’a and increase participation and power sharing by continuing to focus on cultural competencies, parenting and advocacy skills development, and by ensuring
culturally responsive spaces that continue to include Indigenous ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing.

At the same time the YCDC is perceived to be a space of multiple modes of communication, where relational and professional discourses, jargon, are perceived to coexist, for example Amber (Indigenous) recognizes the importance of keeping things professional, but when you have family like atmospheres, like here at the YCDC, those barriers just kind of slip away. Cause, like well I accept everyone who works here regardless of what or where they came from. They all have interesting stories, and everything and when that kind of translates into services…we are all family, we all work together, we are all making this work, we are all partnering with each other to create an atmosphere were everyone feels welcome, then I find those barriers aren’t there.

Further, Amber (Indigenous) infers the role and power of language in CSOs and how it is enacted into everyday action in the organization.

I find that speech is kind of that first, and I am not sure if it’s changing the speech in the workplace first as a means because I find that often times if an organization is in a healthy state there is a lot of healthy speech happening… And if the organization is not, you can usually tell by the way things are said.

For many participants, the YCDC embodies its organizational values in the way they have created a family centred inclusive space, and this praxis, turning organizational language into action, also promotes the perception of cross-cultural bridge building. The caution is to ensure the language used does not become ‘organizational talk’ that is exclusive to professional discourses, jargon, or organizational processes and practices. For example, communication with regard to scheduling and allocation of YCDC resources can lead to frustration and misunderstanding for parents; for example, Stacey (Indigenous) shares that, even today I don’t understand their whole block system. They have these blocks, like you are on A Block, B Block, or…see I don’t even know. Something about their block system and they block off an amount of time and you are not say on Leona’s block this time but maybe you will be in two months. I don’t know.

Language has the power to include and to exclude, to build or break trust and can create spaces for abjection and agency. Stacey (Indigenous) is quick to imply that,
it is the communication. They are awesome with their communication but at the same time there are those little things that pop up that they forget about, and the parents is like what is going on with my kid’s speech and language.

She indicates, as an Indigenous woman, that her lived experience of social citizenship through social services at the YCDC leads her to conclude that the organization takes cultural competencies seriously.

I do want to say something on the First Nations advocacy piece, that the YCDC does a good job not distinguishing between oh you are First Nations, and you are not. You would never know. They don’t treat people differently because they are either First Nations or not. I would have to say they are very culturally competent, in a 100 million ways.

This could be inferred to be another example of the successful implementation again of the organization’s core belief of believing in “cross cultural bridges” and being open to “all cultural values”.

Many participants have also relocated their families to Whitehorse (and Kwanlin Dün) to access social services available at the YCDC for a child (or children) with special needs. Some are within the territory, for as alluded to by Douglas (Settler) previously, funding for such services is often a “numbers game” and therefore the urban capital of Whitehorse becomes the central hub for services in the territory. This is further strengthened by the direct relationship with Federal and Territorial governments. The availability of social services in more rural spaces and places in the territory is for Lyndsay (Indigenous) “why we had to leave Carcross”. As she continues to share her story it suggests that the availability of services for her son is nested within a more complex narrative that includes racism and abjection that resulted in limited choice. She is told if she continued to pursue her education fulltime,

they said if you don’t start spending more time, he is going to end up in jail…
They were like, no we can’t deal with it, and you have got to go. So that left me with no choice but to move to town because I am a single parent, I am in school, and I need to work. I need to do these things.

Again, the implication is that her choice, her generative power, over her own agency is constrained by the service provider’s settler certainties and colonial logics of discrimination of both the racialized and gendered injustices her narrative is layered with. It is at this point that Lyndsay (Indigenous) connected with the YCDC who,
has outreach to Carcross, it is actually the Kwanlin Dün team that does the outreach. It was when I first met Margarette, and she was there with us through all those meetings that we had, and she heard everything they said…the CDC have been a huge support for me and my son.

Here the perceived importance of a key person is inferred in building and maintaining trust and compassionate relationships. All participants who accessed services at Dusk’a spoke of the fundamental role the key person played and how Margarette is trusted by the community. For Lyndsay (Indigenous), the relationship with a key member of the YCDC feels personal and supportive, the relationship is built through time, and the relational trust built is key in the transition of her family to the capital. The most striking difference in her experience is that at the YCDC her family is not racially profiled, but instead, “it is all about your family and goals for your child”.

Kate (Settler) also relocates her family from Nova Scotia, “the whole purpose of this, I don’t have family or friends here, it was strictly to get my son’s help and as far as that goes they have been excellent”. She instead sees abjection as an issue of “labels”:

If you take away all the man made ‘this is our turf, that’s that tuff, this is who this person is’, we really have a lot of similarities everywhere. I think that is the problem that we put those labels up.

Labeling, as discussed in chapter four, frames’ narratives using exogenous criteria that often limits or distorts abject voices by such external categorization. Interestingly, Kate’s (Settler) experience influences her to focus on similarities, a settler privilege when juxtaposed with the generational and racialized gendered violence experience by some of the Indigenous participants of the dual experience of agency and abjection as seen through the lens of *indigenous difference*. Experiences of labeling by participants can foster a sense of belonging and create agency or can abjectify. Kate’s (Settler) narrative of abjection through ‘labels’ is another example of the YCDC as both site of research on citizenship and site of citizenship. Her perception of the YCDC is one of genuine service delivery that is honest and compassionate, “they didn’t say that ‘oh come here is the magic answer to everything’; they said that they will ‘put him on priority’ and he will get seen to and he will get help”. There is argued to be perceived power in having your voice heard that builds trust that is reinforced through respectful interactions that are honest and compassionate; for Kate (Settler) it came down to being treated “collectively, not just one individual with a disability…they actually listen, they take to heart what we say about our son…if I know something’s true then it is great, they listen”. When citizens’ knowledge counts, Indigenous or Settler, the inference is
that it creates opportunities for collective decision making, or as Young argues it becomes a “means of collective problem-solving” (2000: 6). This potentially mitigates the abjection of marginalization whether in this case racial and/or ability based.

This case is argued to be an example of how civil society organizations can be culturally diverse and safe spaces of inclusion. The YCDC’s story has the potential to help and to inform others on how such a space and interactions can create equity through compassionate relationships based on respect, trust, and shared power. That these spaces and places have the potential for fostering empathy or understanding of the abject or marginalized or of another way of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing and how these create different and varying lived experiences of social citizenship.

6.5 Knowledge Production: An intersectional indigeneity perspective of the lived experience of enacting citizenship

This section explores how knowledge is produced in participants’ lived experiences of how social citizenship is enacted. In the following analysis the intersecting and often overlapping perceptions of hegemonic and counter hegemonic citizenship narratives found within the processes and practices enacted in these narratives. Therefore, this knowledge production is explored through the lens of intersectional indigeneity, as discussed in chapter four, and again defined for the purposes of this analysis as lived, practiced, and relational heterogeneity of Indigenous narratives and worldviews as seen in the intersects of principles of indigenous difference, indigenous rights, indigenous belonging, indigenous self-determination, and indigenous spirituality (Hunt 2013; Fleras & Maaka, 2010). This analysis will again allow for an exploration of how participants reconcile the multiplicity of often blurred and nested perceptions of social citizenship within the socio historical context discussed in chapter two and within the specific interactional situations at the YCDC and Dusk’a sites. It also allows for an exploration for the lived experiences of participants of these interactions, relationships, organizational norms, and competing ideologies and worldviews. It also allows again for an analysis of how in turn these influences how participants evoke, understand, and act upon these situations and lived experiences. My intention is to again highlight how whose knowledge counts and how participants’ perceptions and worldviews in this case study also give further voice to the counter narratives of social citizenship. Throughout the interviews it is evident that the land settlement and self government agreement process provides hope for some of an alternative narrative based on shifts in relationships, self-determination and jurisdiction, and shared power that has already shifted and reframed the socio-cultural and socio-political roles and agency of some
participants. The last subsection will probe the participants’ positionality as well as interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in participants lived enacted, embodied, and emplaced experiences of social citizenship and how these influence (or not) knowledge production at the sites of interaction and perceptions at these sites.

6.5.1 Lived, practiced, and relational aspects: multiplicities of knowledges

To explore the lived, practiced, and relational aspects of knowledge production at the sites YCDC and Dusk’a an intersectional lens is utilized. Once again, this lens fosters an analysis centred around concepts of settler colonialism, advocacy, social services and *indigenous difference, indigenous rights, indigenous belonging, indigenous self-determination*, and *indigenous spirituality* at these sites of interactions uncovering whose knowledge counts between predominately Settler female childcare professionals and Indigenous and Settler (or mixed) families accessing services at either or both sites. In keeping with how intersectional indigeneity is defined here, the analysis will first explore the concept of *indigenous difference*, once again allowing for acknowledgement of the heterogeneity of the lived, practiced, and relational Indigenous ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological standpoints nested in the macro constitutional status of “nations within” and meso/micro level of the specific socio-historical context of land-settlement agreements. It is seen as a process of power sharing through partnership and participation (Hunt 2013; Fleras & Maaka, 2010).

The YCDC and its integrated office at the Dusk’a sites of interaction are also potential sites of knowledge production; it can be argued to be thus a site of *indigenous difference* as power is shared between Indigenous family and with predominately Settler staff through the formal and informal partnership and participation. From Amber’s (Indigenous) perspective, the YCDC site is,

very open, there was no ‘we are over here, and you are over there’ and now we are giving services to you. It is ‘come on it everyone is welcome’ and I think that was the…being included like that and everyone taking time to get to know everyone coming in for services made it very different from other stories I have heard, just other stories with services in general in the Yukon.

Amber (Indigenous) perceives that these power sharing moments are experienced in the lived, practiced, and relational implementation of the YCDC’s mission of ‘working with’ her family in an environment that welcomed all. These impressions of the YCDC could imply the breaking down of some of the socio-historic and Settler colonial legacies/barriers discussed at the beginning of the chapter. It also speaks to how through settler colonialism spaces are
created that include and exclude certain citizens and this can in turn positively or adversely impact the perception and reality of social action and service delivery. Participants, both Settler and Indigenous, share these similar impressions of an inclusive welcoming space and where the agency and knowledge of the family is centred.

For Indigenous participants, there is a parallel narrative of the YCDC main offices that needs to be acknowledged in the joint power sharing. Erin’s (Indigenous) perception of the YCDC main office speaks to both, through her multiple roles and intersects with the organization she concludes that,

I think it is important that the CDC is here… to be able to have here in the community in a building that is safe…The CDC building that is downtown is wonderful and they have lots of resource there. It is attached to the Department of Education which fundamentally throughout history has been a big issue for First Nations people. It is far away if you don’t have a vehicle. This speaks to the importance of having YCDC services within community available the Duska site. The effects of these words, of this lasting perception of the space as “governmental” has led to some historic confusion as to the role of the YCDC as Erin (Indigenous) remarks,

say 6-7 years ago many people were confused whether the YCDC was a government organization which as soon as you say government and I am looking at your parenting ability… Maybe you’re a mom who wants a diagnosis for FASD [fetal alcohol spectrum disorder] all of a sudden if you are talking to the government you think of things, social workers, child protective services because they are in a government building. That is the [perception of]

Department of Education and has been for as long as I can remember.

The traumatic memories of the space and mistrust of government refracted through the prism of intersectional indigeneity implies the continual need for shared knowledge production at these sites to ensure that the lived experience of indigenous difference is honoured in the creation of shared spaces of power and partnership like the Dusk’a site. Settler colonial legacies of Indian Residential School in the Yukon and the role of the Department of Education in enacting this policy and the process designed to systematically replace Indigenous systems and ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing with Settler ones means some spaces and places are imbued with a sense of injustice. Niezen (2017) argues this sense of injustice intersects with notions of personhood, parenthood, recognition, courageous disclosures, and evasions, contrition, and defiance. The historical
trauma associated with a space and place can trigger flashbacks of this sense of injustice, which in turn can lead to mistrust thus potential endangering opportunities for power sharing, participation, and partnership.

Lyndsay’s (Indigenous) experiences provide further insights into how these historical traumas impact those intergenerational survivors of these legacies. Settler colonial legacies lead to an instinctive intrinsic mistrust of institutions and because of the Indian Residential School legacy an inherent mistrust specifically of spaces and places of education. She is in essence also a “come from aways”, and her narrative speaks to the intergenerational trauma; in her case of Carcass as the space and place of Chooutla Residential School. For her, the perception of trust in this case goes beyond the organization and the staff but also to the space and place. This implies that the Dusk’a is a site of knowledge production creating a counter narrative to a settler colonial one, that engenders a mistrust of institutions and the spaces and places of education. Lyndsay (Indigenous) further shares that her home community is, not really a community that I can be part of because there is a lot of toxicity …there is a lot of toxic people there. It was the home of the Residential School… So, there are a lot of people who have been significantly damaged, generation, by generation, by generation through that… I feel like I need to re-strengthen my bond with hometown by leaving… Absolutely. I love Carcross so much. I have beautiful memories of the place.

Her nested narratives demonstrate the multi dimensionality of voice mentioned above for her story is one of abjection, resiliency, and the lived experience of indigeneity (i.e., indigenous difference) where memories of beauty are juxtaposed with the toxicity and trauma of the colonial legacy of Indian Residential School.

This counter narrative can also be argued to be a continuation of the advocacy and agency of Indigenous peoples of the Yukon that sparks the land settlement agreement process. Together Today for our Children Tomorrow argues the link between land and knowledge will only be rebalanced if control and responsibility are restored based on Indigenous ontologies, epistemologies, axiologies and methodologies. Despite the documented role of education and educational sites in settler colonial constructions that reinforce structures of inequality in the territory, education and educational sites are being reclaimed and reimagined through the shift of jurisdiction under land settlement agreements as an example of indigenous self-determination. For Erin (Indigenous), the land settlement agreements are seen as not only tools that reclaimed land, “it is different here” in Kwanlin Dün, but also as a tool that leads to “a lot less racism” as “everyone goes to school
together…no separation”. Similarly, Alayne (Settler) perceives the land settlement agreements and devolution of the territorial government in combination with the geographic and demographic realities as what allowed the government(s) to “recognize the importance of the communities and the work in the communities”. This is further supported in the shift and increased ongoing guarantee of funds that followed the 1995 Umbrella Agreement. For Erin (Indigenous) and Alayne (Settler), the land settlement agreement is perceived to have created a space for the development of a holistic child centred space based on the Kwanlin Dün epistemology that is situated on the land. It also allows for the partnership between the YCDC and Dusk’a to be formalized and service to be provided in community, and from Erin’s (Indigenous) perspective “nothing else is available even compares to the YCDC or even works with children the way the YCDC does”. It allows for integrated services to be provided in an indigenized space. As a result, Erin (Indigenous) is awarded the Government of Canada’s 2017 Certificate of Excellence for her leadership in cultural excellence and encouraging cultural opportunities that are making visible the once ignored, rejected, and suppressed knowledges and heritages.

The shared lived experiences of both Indigenous and Settler participants Barb, Chantelle, Jolene, Lyndsay, Marguerite, and Wanda of the Dusk’a site also highlight the importance of centring Kwanlin Dün as well as the heterogeneity of Indigenous worldviews within the space. As Sarah (Settler) puts it,

having many of the First Nations with land claims settled, having some form of self-governing is amazing…we are still working on how those puzzle pieces fit together in the territory as in how First Nations and non-First Nations work together, people work together, organization together…I really like the way the YCDC partners with Kwanlin Dün and are in the daycare. This statement implies the link between the partnership and power sharing creates spaces and places for multiple ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. Participation in power sharing partnerships enables indigenous difference and the establishment of this type of culturally responsive shared space and practices, and for participants like Chantelle (Indigenous) it is a key aspect. This perception of responsiveness by providing services is perceived by her as being “based on is the Native culture and I really believe strongly in that for my kids and that is what I want for them”. Further analysis of the effect of this phrasing highlights the perception of the joint effort to un/decolonize the assimilative educational history of territory and of the desire for this type of culturally responsive shared spaces and practices. Further to this, Wanda’s (Indigenous) narrative also emphasizes the difference in
not only her perceptions of *indigenous difference* at the two sites, but also *indigenous self-determination* and *indigenous spirituality* in the cultural connection to the land. As she recalls,

The YCDC…I remember once when my grandson punch one of them nurses and he just about broke her nose. I was so upset, and I thought oh no my kid won’t be able to go back. It was so nice they just kept him for all his anger and helped him. Oh yeah, they helped him a lot. He didn’t just get passed through. I thought they didn’t do much for my granddaughter because they came from downtown, and they just don’t have the time... If you want that worker, then get that worker and get somebody to help her and pay that money out and get some good help. You can get some like over here, those teachers they speak the language. Just think about it. Some of them take those little kids out and take them to look for medicine plants, things that are edible, like that is how you get better on the land…Even if you are just a little tiny weeny thing that reconnects you.

Wanda’s (Indigenous) narrative of accessing services at the Dusk’a site further underlines the perception that the YCDC are professionals that centre the child and family’s interests in their practices, and enhanced through shared power, participation, and partnership with an indigenized space of service. However, although Wanda (Indigenous) acknowledges that the last relocation to the current village site has meant better services for community members, there is less of a connection, a sense of belonging. She relates,

But I worked in the old village, and I thought that in the old village people were closer, closer knit. They helped each other a lot. I liked it. It was harsh but it was likable. It was a challenge at that time it was a challenge because there wasn’t any water. They hauled water there. The other thing there was some prejudices from the uptown people because the first people who lived into Whitehorse sort of lived along the river. They had little settlements, and they just kept getting pushed and pushed until they finally ended up way down there… [Then during the goldrush] Yep, they [Settlers] kept pushing First Nations down to the other end of Whitehorse, to the industrial area. There is not a whole lot around there but still I guess at one time it had lots of nice trees and probably a nice place to camp. But after when you had to cut down all the trees and everything it doesn’t become such a nice place to camp… Some of the places were a little bit dilapidated and the heath care was poor, and I would
say, and I would say we, up here, have some of the best health care that there is. The services are superb, yes. 

Her narrative provides insights into the generational experiences of connectiveness to space and place of the ‘old village’, traumas of colonial legacies of racism and forced relocation, and the positive experience of return of local jurisdiction and delivery of culturally responsive services.

Jolene (Indigenous) also relates more services have been offered over the last 30 years in the relocated village than in the old village. However, both Indigenous Elders, Wanda and Jolene, speak of the violence and addictions that they both perceive to be a direct result of the disconnection and loss of the sense of belonging within the community as a result of the relocation. As Jolene (Indigenous) explains her lived experiences of how the community, has struggled with alcohol and drugs quite a bit. I see it going around, lots of dealers, lots of people dealing out of their homes, lots of children stuck in that cycle. You know, then they get caught up in the addictions too. Then it is just a cycle that continues. It is going on right now. Lots of violence and a few murders up here in the last few years…It is like I lived here 30 years and I still like don’t really know my neighbors. So, that is the kind of community we live in.

Similarly, Wanda (Indigenous) relates,

I once would have described it as a safe place and through the years that I have lived here it’s become a place that I find not safe anymore because of the drug addictions…and alcoholism; alcoholism used to be the big challenge, but addictions are even worse because they cause more violence and ah actually more deaths.

Jolene (Indigenous) and Wanda’s (Indigenous) lived experiences of relocation because of land settlement agreements could imply more rights and services while also indicating a parallel one of less belonging, less connection, and a loss of the sense of community. An example of agency and abjection working in accordance. For in Jolene’s (Indigenous) experience and opinion,

All the resources, even the Elders funding, gets used up for these mortgages for these houses. All the money goes towards the mortgages for these houses. You know what they should have done here? This is my opinion; they should have build houses. Built the community here and then rented it out to the
white people and build us cabin out in the bush where we wanted our cabins built. And use this place as a revenue generator.

Jolene’s (Indigenous) opinion implies a desire to reconnect with the land, “out in the bush”, and this aligns with Wanda’s (Indigenous) comments on how the relocations have impacted the community and create a sense of disconnection for Elders to space and place where they enact, embody, and emplace their indigeneity. Consideration of these subjectivities, in particular the perception of each other and of each site, could be in this case tied to the sense of belonging inherent in taking part in a collective action in an over twenty plus year relationship and deliver of shared services in two specific spaces. However, further analysis of the subjectivities within participants’ perspectives of indigenous self-determination, also highlights the perception of the land settlement agreement role in creating this type of space for indigeneity to be lived, practiced, and relational is contested by both the Elders who participated in this research. These generational differences in perception will be further explored below.

In addition to these contested lived experiences of the participants’ perceptions of how the land settlement and self government agreements and relocation site of the community creates, or not, a sense of belonging and community through indigenous difference, indigenous rights, indigenous belonging, indigenous self-determination, and indigenous spirituality, a few of the participants also feel that the YCDC could improve its cultural responsiveness at both sites, and its outreach services. First is the perception of who the YCDC is. Many participants speak of how the YCDC is often seen as an intergovernmental organization because of its location in the old dormitory adjacent to the Ministry of Education. This misperception is linked directly to the lived experience of all the Indigenous participants in this case study with the direct and intergenerational traumas related to the settler colonial legacy of Indian Residential Schools. As relayed, there is a tension between balancing this perception with a perceived limited capacity to access infrastructure funding and an alternative central location on which to possibly build a new YCDC not connected to the Ministry of Education. As Alayne (Settler) puts it,

I feel sometimes being attached to a government building like we are sometimes sets up perceptions with families. I feel like that is a perception we are always battling of people understanding that we are a non-governmental organization because we do get our core funding from them. It is easy to make that mistake.
This perception continues to create unintentional additional barriers to service delivery for some Indigenous families.

These lived experiences imply a continued inherent mistrust of settler colonial institutions of education, as well as how these perceptions live on in the spaces and places they occupy. The effect of these perceptions speaks to the importance of where a service is provided, to space and place, and it implies that the Dusk’a site is essential to the continuation of the un/decolonizing of education and child/family services in Kwanlin Dün. They are also connected to the land settlement agreement processes initial purpose in 1970 and reclaiming of jurisdiction over land and education through self-governance. As Jolene’s (Indigenous) lived experience of accessing YCDC services at Dusk’a attests,

I really really like having them in our offices, right in the daycare. So, I don’t have to take him down and drive him here and drive him there. I just take him down and whatever he needs it is just there. Then they could focus on him and then they go into the classes, and they study him to see how he is doing… like you do not need people knowing what is going on within your life. It is more of an informal way of him getting the help that he needs, and nobody has to point fingers at him and say look he has to go to that special place over there.

It is just right there.

Jolene’s (Indigenous) words also imply the importance of the space and place in relation to services and trusting relationship being developed. However further into our discussion, Jolene (Indigenous) also indicates that there are still certain practices, such as restraining, that are triggers for her. If Dusk’a is to be a space and place where education is continually un/decolonizing and cultural practices are integrated into the services, Jolene (Indigenous) felt that the “restraining” is not necessary nor culturally appropriate and feels that this is “where the Elders come in, that is where an Elder would come in to just sit there. It is a calming sense for an Elder to be sitting there”. She describes “restraining” during “tantrums” as holding by putting arms around a child; although she states it wasn’t violent it clearly upset her greatly.

Acculturation and integration due to the socio-historic and political macro and meso contexts outlined at the beginning of this dissertation are argued to have led to a shift in the perception of community processes and in the prominence of Elders in activities in Kwanlin Dün (Alcantara, 2013). However, Elders are observed during the field work to be directly involved and present at Dusk’a as a result of Erin’s (Indigenous) leadership creating a cultural space that integrates Elders and Knowledge Keepers; this type of integration is
observed to a lesser extent at the downtown main site and only one staff self-identifies as an Indigenous Elder/Knowledge Keeper. Subjectivities in the lived experience of participants could also be perceived as the ongoing mistrust of educational provision by or in partnership with Settler organizations (or even those funded by the government). This implies that it is not just about providing YCDC services in the community imbedded within Dusk’a but also that the space and place has the materials to continue to pursue and revitalize multigenerational literacy that are stepped in the language and culture and locally controlled and developed; a shift from needs focused service to self-determining autonomy of child and family services. An argument can be made that the land settlement agreements create a space for partnership, jurisdiction over local knowledge production, opportunities for participation and power sharing for some participants (generational differences will be more fully explored below). They also create a ‘space’ perceived to be one of un/decolonizing, a space of addressing the intergenerational impacts of the continued settler colonialism, i.e., better houses, increase economic capacity, jurisdiction over land, health and education, and improved political and social condition via self government.

These subjectivities lead Lyndsay (Indigenous) to identify communication as key to building trust. For her, it is about “communication, reaching those hard-to-reach places, you know, because I know a lot of families who are just scared to bring up issues that they are having with their children”. Space, place, and local knowledge again are inferred to be key aspects of rebuilding trust with education and educational institutes for Indigenous peoples through participatory and power sharing communication. Lyndsay (Indigenous) goes further to comment that communication is also impacted by the fact that most of the service providers, the Settler professionals, are typically quite young and not from the Territory. This generational gap in local knowledge and history often times heightens the already existing mistrust. Added to this, Stacey (Indigenous) observes the YCDC communication is in most cases “amazing” but often there are challenges related to “organizational talk”, i.e., specific terms or acronyms that are not often translated for families. These subjectivities in the narratives of participants’ knowledge production and power sharing at these sites of interaction demonstrates how these spaces between can create spaces for agency and abjection. Participants all spoke of how by embedding the YCDC at the Dusk’a site is a step towards un/decolonizing through re-centring Indigenous ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing that is perceived to foster participants’ agency in knowledge production and power sharing.
6.5.2 Agency as resiliency: knowledge as indigeneity

The lived experience of political agency is argued from a feminist perspective to “attest to the capacity for autonomous action in the face of often overwhelming cultural sanctions and structural inequities” (McNay, 2000:10). Through the lens of intersectional indigeneity, the narratives of the lived experience for all of the participants who access services can be viewed as examples of this type of attestation of how agency and abjection can work in concert. Resilience is witnessed in the narratives of all parents and families of children with special needs; for example, one of the participants relocated her family from Nova Scotia to the Yukon in order to access perceived better services at the YCDC. This lens also brings to light the subjectivities experienced by the Indigenous participants and how their narratives highlight agency and resilience. Both are seen as intertwined with culturally distinct concepts of self in relation to the land and environment, an interconnected identity formed through collective narratives, languages, and traditions (Kirmayer, et al., 2011).

Lived experience of being in a space and place where the land settlement agreement process is undertaken, whether Kwanlin Dün or the territorial capital of Whitehorse, underscores the legacy of continued agency and resilience in the face of continued Settler colonialism. It is seen as a continuation of Yukon First Nations legacy of mobilization, advocacy, and negotiation in opposition to land appropriation for resource development that has culminated in these land settlement agreements; a process perceived to be a prescriptive unequal intergovernmental negotiating exercise that results in benefit for some but has not yet addressed all of the legacies of continued settler colonialism. This perception can be seen in Wanda’s (Indigenous) views of the relocation of the community Kwanlin Dün to its currently location; although she readily admits to some benefits, for her the disconnection to space and place for Elders and the prevalence of addictions and violence are tied to lack of full jurisdiction and access to the necessary resources. As Fleras & Maaka argues, the politization of Indigenous peoples as “peoples with rights” further exposes the tensions between “state determination versus Indigenous self-determining autonomy” (2009:56). These rights are collective, inherent, and relational but even under the land settlement agreements they are expressed in relation to a set of incentive conditions that re-establishes the relationship to the Crown with regard to certain jurisdictions as partial, relative, yet relational autonomy (Alcantara, 2013; Fleras & Maaka, 2010).

Land Settlement agreements can be argued to give “some agency” in relation to the socio-historical, cultural, political, and institutional constraints and concessions still in effect through continued settler colonialism. Concurrently they are also perceived to be tools of
colonialism and acculturation, a giving up of one’s birth right for a fraction of the territory and limited actual devolution of jurisdiction (Palmater, 2011; Manuel & Derrickson, 2015), a land surrender, and a non option by some. These agreements are often impacted by internal cohesion and government perceptions of Indigenous peoples (Alcantara, 2013). Negotiations and funding are based on external notions of “status” and not on internal definitions of citizenship. Despite, as Palmater argues the fact “self-government agreements…will continue to affect our future generations” (2011:174-175). For example, Teslin Tlingit take issue to the devolution of the jurisdiction over funding based on citizenship not status; and, in 2019 the Yukon Supreme Court decision ruled in favour of the community and instructed “the federal government to provide funding on a per capa basis that includes all First Nations citizens, not just for those with ‘Indian status’” (CBC, 2019). Political agency and agency as resilience are argued to thus be experienced over time as these processes are decades in the making and continue to this present day. Kirmayer et al. research demonstrates “forms of resilience vary” and Indigenous forms of resiliency are influenced by both individual and collective agency “grounded in cultural values” and infused with spirituality (2001:86-88) that create place-specific ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. Sustaining agency over time can be argued to require resiliency to engage continually in a process within historical and continued context of persistent patterns of epistemic inequalities, violences, and injustices. As this section demonstrates within the participants’ lived experience of social citizenship agency and resilience are observed to work in concert in the shared space of Dusk’a, this space and place within the community I argue creates opportunities for knowledge as indigeneity. A space and place where the knowledge that is centred, that ‘counts’, is Indigenous, is Kwanlin Dün.

Kwanlin Dün also provides an interesting case as it is the first claim settled involving land located in a major city, a space and place Kwanlin Dün had to fight against ‘illegal’ economic development on its unceded territory and as part of the land settlement and self-government agreement conceded much of its unceded territory as well as relocate its members. Participants, particularly among the generation of community Elders or emerging Elders, see this as disrupting sense of place for some which creates subjectivities and counter narratives. YCDC as both a site of research on and a site of social citizenship is argued to create a space to also explore with participants their subjectivities and counter narratives. In the next section, further analysis of the apparent generational gaps in the lived experience of participants highlights the normalization of perceptions of Indigenous peoples, as well as the perceived Elder abuse as a result of the ongoing intergenerational traumas due to the legacies
of continued settler colonialism. As all but one of the participants is female, the next section analyzes their lived experiences in order to centre women’s knowledge in social citizenship processes and practices.

6.5.3 Counter Narratives: Matrilineal Feminism & Generational Gap

Self-reflexivity and self-conscious attentiveness to power dynamics and relationships through an intersectional indigeneity lens, I argue, teases out two alternative narratives within the lived experience of the female participants. These narratives as argued above speak to how the creation of Kwanlin Dün, in accordance with the land settlement agreement, the establishing of the new village as well as Dusk’a, is experienced differently across the generations. Special attention will be given to the task of advocacy bestowed upon me during the data collection phase. Elders I spoke with during site visits, sharing circles, and who I interviewed all tasked me to “speak their truth” about the impact of settler colonial legacies upon them, in particular the Elder abuse and the prevalence of addictions and violence. Juxtaposed this with the perception of the younger women who see the land settlement agreements as a positive step towards restoration of indigenous self-determination and the resurgence/reassertion of the matrilineal power, of matrilineal feminism. During my second visit to the territory and presentation of my initial findings each generation acknowledged the others’ perspectives, lived experiences, and requested to ensure these concurrent lived realities are highlighted. Again, the conversations with participants about YCDC and citizenship creates this new space, a new interaction, to then raise other ‘issues’ of social citizenship within participants’ lived experience beyond the place of the CSO, providing a fuller picture of the nested lived, practiced, and relational aspects. By creating this new space, I argue the CSO has the potential to further centre Indigenous citizens’ lived experiences in their own social actions. These opportunities for joint knowledge production, as argued above, create opportunity for knowledge as indigeneity, for participation, partnership, and power sharing.

These lived, practiced, and relational aspects within the subjectivities and counter narratives of participants’ lived experience of social citizenship are also nested within the socio-historic and current context of continued settler colonialism. Therefore, it is of importance to note the lasting impacts of the Indian Residential School legacy in the Yukon is only one generation removed, both Elders formally describe how for them their own traumas and their families and community’s intergenerational trauma of the legacy of Indian Residential School era continue to be disconnecting, devastating, and demoralizing. These perspectives are reconfirmed in the narratives of the other Indigenous participants and
acknowledged by all of the Settler participants in this study. These notions are echoed in the sharing circles, during my observations, and reconfirmed during the presentation of initial findings. Dumont-Smith’s (2002) review of the limited available literature on Elder abuse finds that the “intergenerational transmission of violence” is one of the common contributing factors. Very little research or information exists on Indigenous Elder abuse in Canada. Due to the socio historical and continue context of continued settler colonialism and the legacies of epistemic injustice and violence that enables abjection, agency, and resilience to work in concert also creates spaces were Elders are more susceptible to abuse and violence. The intergenerational trauma experienced by those who have raised or who are raising multiple generations of their family because of the loss of parenting skills, and prevalence of addictions and violence also share narratives of Elder abuse. Often, as the primary care giver, it is these Elders who are interacting with the YCDC. Therefore, their lived, practiced, and relational subjectivities and counter narratives are the lived experiences the CSO is also nested in.

For example, in 2019, evidence and legal findings of the National Inquiry into Murder and Missing Indigenous Women and Girls show Canada has and continues to engage in “race-based genocide” (NIMMIWG, 2019); this is in alignment with the findings of the TRC on Residential Schools that also showed Canada was guilty of biological, cultural, and physical genocide (NIMMIWG, 2019; Palmater, 2019; TRC, 2015). Palmater argued that “race-base genocide” is also gendered as “the unique way in which supremacy and colonization objectives target Indigenous women and girls” (2019). Kwanlin Dün has not been untouched, for example there were four murders in the community of barely a 1000 between 2014-2017. Also, Jolene (Indigenous) shares her lived experiences of violence, addictions, and murders within the community and implies legal, political, and social systems continue to be impacted by continued settler colonialism. Although no participants directly mention how these legacies impacted the relationship with the RCMP, the secondary data, observations, and off the record conversations imply the widespread community mistrust continues in Kwanlin Dün. In 2019, the newspaper reports that in Kwanlin Dün, “Women were sleeping with baseball bats besides their beds” (Globe&Mail, 2019). Since the research, the community has implemented a community policing initiative (ibid) that is gaining national and international recognition as a potential transformative Indigenous solution to the colonial legacies of violence and addictions. In 2020, Kwanlin Dün, Yukon, and the Federal governments signed a tripartite agreement to now have three RCMP officers stationed in the community. This is seen by the community as a way of rebuilding the widespread mistrust by
working with the community (CBC, 2020). If the initial evidence has merit, it could be argued to be another grassroots example of Kwanlin Dün’s indigeneity in action through implementing self-determination the creates a renewed sense of belonging.

As Wanda’s (Indigenous) lived experience of social citizenship highlights another often hidden or unacknowledged reality of the continued legacy of colonialism for Indigenous women, particularly grandmothers, agency of choice in child rearing. As she puts it,

there are these little kids that are stuck in welfare, or they are stuck with grandma or whatever. It never crosses any young person’s mind that here is an old grandma, she is 75, she is 80, she is whatever, she is an old grandma who has already raised her own children, she’s raised some grandchildren and now she is raising some great-grandchildren. Ok, how tired is she, where can we help her, what is we can do for her. Those things don’t happen.

As Lister (2003) argues agency and citizenship are linked through both hierarchical and generative power relations. Wanda’s (Indigenous) experience implies that the result of being a subordinate object of the heteropatriarchal and racialized colonial legacies have limited her ability to generatively express power in her own life fully. Her agency, as she perceives it, is related to her perception all grandmothers in the village choice has been taken from them as they are rarely “asked” or are offered help; it is just assumed regardless of capacity that Elders will take on the care of children as part of their communal relational role. She is quick to add, she had the capacity to care for generations of children, “I could pay”, but that others in the community did not have the same resources. For Jolene (Indigenous), it comes down to this role of grandmothers’, and for her “they are just comforting” and many take on the care of multiple generations of children in her community who are “caught in the cycle”, the cycle of abuse, addictions, and violence. However, I argue these Elders shared their lived experience, what I witnessed in the community, observed at the sites of interaction, as well as the confirmation of my initial findings in the sharing circle, leads me to conclude Elder are also caught up in this cycle too.

Narratives of Elder abuse are also situated within the larger story of continued settler colonialism and the discrimination and violence against Indigenous women. As a child, Wanda (Indigenous) was the oldest grandchild, and her Chinese grandfather insisted all of his children and grandchildren were apprenticed in the various restaurants they owned in BC and the Yukon. She claims she was never told why directly, but when she was nine, she was sent to the Yukon to live with “aunties” and shares,
Well, I don’t know why they sent me; I think it was part of what was wrong at home so that I must go away so that old dirty men cannot bother you. So, they sent me away there and it took me a long time to figure out why, but I finally got it together.

One of the few ways her mother felt she could counter the patriarchal dominance and protect her daughter from gendered violence and potential abuse was to send her away to relatives; Wanda (Indigenous) was sent to her Indigenous aunties who took on the role of child rearing. This is argued to be an example of lived, practiced, and relational agency in an abject situation. Further in the conversation we spoke about how young women today truly do not always grasp that the reason they are allowed or can make the choice they are free to make is because of women like Wanda (Indigenous), and others over the last 100 years of women changing things. Her candid response sums up her perspective and lived experience of gendered violence legislatively, collectively, and individually required as a call for the need for “changing stinking thinking”. Heteropatriarchy and racialization in the continued settler colonial legacies are characterized by a history of discrimination and violence against Indigenous people, a legacy of racialized epistemic injustices.

The demographic makeup of what is now called the Yukon and the heterogeneity of the Indigenous participants, the ‘come from aways’, also means that their lived experiences of the lived, practiced, and relational are nested and shaped by the spaces and places, of where they came from. For Kona (Indigenous), the visibility of First Nations in the Yukon, in Whitehorse, is in stark contrast to Saskatchewan. When she speaks of the prevalence for violence against women the raw emotion in her voice speaks to the reality of what is happening in our society that is not being acknowledged. It implies a need to further unpack how legislation like the Indian Act impacts relationships in social settings where citizens who are abjectified through the continued colonial legacy participate in citizenship processes and practices. It is all interconnected. I argue as Canadians we tend to shy away from speaking truths about our history and how it impacts the everyday lived experiences of those who are continually abjectified in our society. For example, Kona (Indigenous) shares that in Saskatchewan, the

Like ‘starlight tours’ in 2001, that was happening when I was going to university and stuff. Missing and murdered aboriginal women…um (can hear emotion in her voice), one of my classmates went missing and we had later found out was murder. I mean she was picked up at a bar that we all attend, I was at house parties with her. Like it has so easily been any of us.
Implied within this powerful sharing, is Kona’s (Indigenous) perceptions that it could have easily been her simply for being an Indigenous female. A fuller understanding of the nested lived experiences of participants, particularly those who are marginalized or legislatively made abject via multiple interlocking oppressions based on race, gender and colonization as Indigenous women are, creates space again for knowledge as indigeneity. The CSO becomes a potential place to actualize indigenous difference, “a space of cross-cultural bridges”, through its family centred model. Kona (Indigenous) continues by sharing how upset it makes her when other Indigenous people do not see the connection between violence against Indigenous women and the unhealthy society and continued colonial processes and practices.

Yeah. So, you know I was talking to my brother, and I remember having a conversation when things were happening with Daryll Knight’s case when everything came out. And he was like, ‘oh, yeah, well it is not like that here’. I said, I am sorry I am going to cry (emotionality in her voice), I said, ‘you don’t think it is like that here in Melfort? Because you are a good Indian because we have lived here our whole lives and everyone knows you for 40 years, you are just a ‘good Indian’’. I am so sorry, I am just…(crying)… Ok. (silence) And he got upset with me and I am like, ‘we have just had our eyes blinded for so long thinking that we fit in here but really, we are just good Indians’.

Kona’s (Indigenous) phrasing here speaks to her experiences as an Indigenous woman of epistemic violence, the intergenerational trauma of being conditioned to be ‘a good Indian’ is concurrently a tactic of self-preservation, and example of agency as resiliency, and as an example of internalized colonization through assimilation and proximation.

### 6.6 A Summary of the exploration and analytic findings

Based on the analysis of participants perceptions of citizenship as rights, as reciprocity and as belonging, as relational, and as spiritual I also argue in this case study that there are two divergent perceptions of social citizenship, one as self in relation and as self within a larger community. The socio historical and traditional nature of the space and place that is now Whitehorse and Kwanlin Dün where many from away gather, are welcomed seasonally, and long-term interrelationships appear to have continued in the perception and principals of inclusiveness in Kwanlin Dün’s land settlement and self government agreements. The heterogeneity of Indigenous worldviews does not in this case allow for the same continuity in the argument of what a solely Kwanlin Dün-specific moiety-based citizenship constitutes. However, given the socio-historical contest and modern continuation
of this principal of inclusiveness, then this heterogeneity of ontologies and epistemologies are intersecting and interrelating to create a sense of belonging that is truly a reflection of the space and place. Still the perspectives shared do show that there is a divergence in Settler and Indigenous views on citizenship similarly to the British Columbia/Tsilhqot’in case study as the marked difference again was the relationship with the land and the differentiated ways it influences citizenship as rights, as belonging, as relational, and as spiritual.

Lived experiences are layered and nested and in many cases agency and abjection worked in concert with participants’ axiological, ontological, and epistemological expressions of their social citizenship and whose knowledge counts which is impacted by proximity and interactions over time. The continued settler colonial logics of acculturation means these distinctions are entangled and often blurred as they are again not as dichotomously opposed in these shared lived experiences. However, re-problematising the context as continued settler colonialism helps to tease out the influence of continued settler privilege inherent throughout these narratives of the notions of rights, belonging, relationality, and spirituality in the lived experiences of social citizenship enactment, embodiment, and emplacement. Indigenous self governance will take time in the Yukon as will the ability to analyze whether the land settlement and self-government agreement process is true grassroots indigeneity or if it is a continuation of colonialism. Either way the lived, practiced, and relational aspects of their lived experiences demonstrated how participants concurrent agency and abjection challenges the logics of the power of continued settler colonialism and the national mythology of this country. Therefore, through the re-problematised lens these experiences, in particular of citizenship in relation, become politics in relation framed by ontological, epistemological, and axiological notions of power and place.

Based on this analysis of knowledge production, I argue the lived experience of enacting, embodying, and emplacing social citizenship demonstrate that many participants perceive knowledge production at these sites of interaction to be imbued with agency (i.e., partnerships, participation, and power sharing) while nested in concurrent experiences of abjection both localized and within the broader socio historic and political contexts. The multiplicities of knowledges produced acknowledges the heterogeneity of both Indigenous and Settler lived, practiced, and relational experiences of social citizenship. These narratives also show how at each site indigenous difference is honoured as are the counter narratives that acknowledged how space and place can create a sense of belonging but also trigger traumatic memories of colonial legacies, logics, mechanisms, processes, and practices.
Participants’ lived experiences also highlights a continued need to advocate for vigilance so *indigenous difference* is used to create counter narratives of space like Dusk’a. Knowledge production at this site is nested within these notions of agency and advocacy that are linked to the land, to self-determination, and to the responsibility to restore Indigenous systems and ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. Participation and power sharing in turn foster these spaces and place of *indigenous difference, indigenous rights, indigenous belonging, indigenous self-determination, and indigenous spirituality* to create more inclusive and indigenized services and advocacy.

Counter narratives between and within the heterogeneity of all participants and their experiences emphasizes the power of interlocking oppressions, of the racial, gendered, colonial, and generational aspects that include the multiplicities of voice and knowledge production that embody the notion of agency and abjection working in consort. These contested nested lived experiences of social citizenship imply that land settlement agreements have had both a perceived positive and negative effect in practice. There also appears to be a continued need for caution in relationships and service delivery to counter the ongoing mistrust due to the persistent impacts of continued settler colonialism and focus on the ‘space’ the land settlement agreements create for partnership, participation, and power sharing through the devolution of social services. These local knowledge production sites are argued to be spaces and places of indigeneity, and this highlights the intersectional subjectivities in participants’ lived experience of the agency and resiliency. Agency and resiliency are observed to work in concert in spaces and places of indigeneity, where the knowledge that ‘counts’ is localized and indigenized. These subjectivities also point to counter narratives that are gendered and generational that speak of the continued racialized and gendered violence experienced by Indigenous women and the heart wrenching reality of Elder abuse. As well as to heed the poignant call of Elder Wanda (Indigenous) to change “stinking thinking”.

The stories of lived experience of social citizenship process and practices within the political and civil spaces of CSOs demonstrate the impact of interactions and relationships of these sites. They show how divergent worldviews and ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing can be the bridge as in this case through the social action of the enacting values of respect, trust, honesty, and compassion. This case also highlights whose knowledge counts in the lived experience of social citizenship in the Pacific Northwest of Canada and specifically at the YCDC and Dusk’a. This is inferred from examples of the principles of indigeneity in their social action, in the doing what you say through enacting, embodying,
and emplacing values. Kate (Settler) speaks of this in her perception of the services her family receives as honest and genuine, “I appreciate that they are honest, goals are realistic”.

This chapter has presented the findings of the second case study on the Yukon, Whitehorse, Kwanlin Dün and YCDC and the Dusk’a centre. Participants perspectives on the sites of interaction allows for an exploration of the perception of agency and abjection in the lived experiences of social citizenship processes and practices. Axiological praxis in this case is argued to fostered partnership, participation, and power sharing in of social justice action and service delivery done with communities. There are generational differences in positionality and generative power that highlights the often-unspoken reality of Elder abuse. Knowledge production in this case is lived, practiced, and relational but seen through a gendered perspective (all but one participant was female) further teases out the layered nature of the lived experience of social citizenship. This case gives a space and place for voices to be heard that provides narratives of agency as resiliency and demonstrates how agency and abjection can be in accordance with how the everyday lived experience of social citizenship is enacted, embodied, and emplaced.
Chapter Seven: The Pacific Northwest: The Confounding, the Similar and the Dissimilar Perceptions of Privilege and Abjection

This chapter focuses on the substantive comparative insights across both cases and the critical interpretations and implications of why they may exist. The intersubjective narratives of the participants are linked to the macro, meso, and micro contexts in which they are nested as seen in the contextual analysis of the previous two substantive chapters. The analysis of these nested intersubjective narratives now turns to the thematic comparison of similarities and differences and the contextual and compositional interpretations of participants’ lived experiences of social citizenship in the intersecting spaces and places CSOs create between Settler and Indigenous citizens. An intersectional indigeneity approach allows for an analytical comparison of both cases that shows how a shared Settler paradigm and a shared Indigenous paradigm of these lived experiences emerge. For the purposes of this research and comparative analysis, paradigm is defined as the shared ontologies underlying the epistemologies, axiologies, and methodologies, the ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing of Indigenous and Settler lived experience of social citizenship at the sites under investigation. The differences will then be argued to highlight how participants’ lived experiences are nuanced expressions of the national discourse, agency as resiliency, and resistance insitu. This approach not only demonstrates the continued systematic abjection of Indigenous peoples in these spaces and places but also the concurrent narratives of resilience, resistance, resurgence, re-emergence, and of the awakening from cultural silencing of continued settler colonialism. These concurrent narratives also show the difference time or exposure to colonialism can be argued to have on assimilative and internalization of colonialism as the matrilineal and matriarchal perspectives are more forefront within the gendered view of agency as generational in the second case study.

The comparative analysis in this chapter of the two cases will have the following structured sections: a comparison of socio-historic context, civil society organizations in context, a thematic comparison of first the participants’ lived experiences of social citizenship, then organizational agency, and finally whose knowledge counts at these sites of research on social citizenship and sites of social citizenship. This will be followed by a summary of the comparative analysis and the chapter will end with a brief recap of how the limitations in chapter four have possibly impacted the findings and my interpretations of the implications. To be fully inclusive of all aspect of these emergent paradigms, in this chapter the phrase ‘ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing’ will be used to represent the
interconnectedness and interplay of ontology, epistemology, axiology, and methodology lens through which participants perceived the lived experience of social citizenship.  

7.1 Athabaskan Awareness & Colonial Legacies ~ Fur Trades & Gold Rushes

A comparative analysis of the nested intersubjective narratives of participants’ lived experience of social citizenship in both cases highlights socio-historical contextual similarities, differences, and a few confounding implications. Both case studies show how the colonial and illegal annexing of land to create what is now British Columbia and the Yukon without treaties. This illegal annexing of land impacted and continues to influence the lived experiences of social citizenship, as well as the intersections and relationships of Tšilhqot’in and Settlers and of Kwanlin Dün and Settlers. For example, both the Tšilhqot’in and the Kwanlin Dün languages are part of the Athabaskan language family, and both describe themselves as “people of the river”. Precontact both Nations are matrilineal and matriarchal; however, Kwanlin Dün governance and social structures are based on moieties while the Tšilhqot’in developed governance and social structures based on societies. These linguistic and socio-cultural similarities highlight points of intersection in each Nation’s ontological, epistemological, and axiological construction of social citizenship processes and practices and the shared lived experience of these linguistic and cultural contexts. On the other hand, although the differences in the moieties and societies are noted in this dissertation, these differences require a further specific in-depth exploration.

Both Nations experienced the fur trade; for the Tšilhqot’in it is to be an example of the dangers of intersecting with these new Settlers in their traditional territories. Oral histories and work done by Tom Swanky (2012) both show how these first explorers into the territory intentionally spread smallpox in order to clear the land. After that, Tšilhqot’in people along the eastern border, the ɁElhdaqox’tin, as Tšilhqot’in Knowledge Keeper Joyce Charleyboy (Personal communication, 2020) reminds me, they had smallpox go through their community and then many more left when they put the fort there, Fort Alexandria; they fought the system and lost. That is why Chief Alexis was adamant on burning the fort at Fort Chilcotin he was 11 or 12 when his family fled Alexandria.

The Tagish Kwan peoples experience of the fur trade is via Indigenous intermediaries who then traded directly with the Russians and then later the Americans. Along with the fur traders came the missionaries to both Nations and both brought foreign diseases that had an adverse impact on both Nations. Oral traditions in the Tšilhqot’in speak of large communities along both sides of the river, and interactions, interrelations, and trade with their neighbors.
the Secwepemc and Nuxalk Nations. Stories of how smallpox was intentionally spread and how it decimated entire families and communities are still shared. It is estimated the disease wiped out between 50-70 percent of the pre-contact population in the area (Swanky, 2016; 2012) Similarly, the ancestors of Kwanlin Dün the Tagish Kwan felt the impact of disease, but it was lessened by the role the intermediators played during the fur trade era. Everything changed again with the discover of gold in both territories. These experiences are the seeds of the generational mistrust that persists today in both Nations of midugh (non- T̓silhqot’in) or “come from aways”.

Both the Cariboo Gold Rush and the Klondike Gold Rush brings an influx of both short term and long-term Settlers to each space and place and changed not only the physical environment but also forever shifted the social relations and lived experiences. In both spaces, this rush to resources extraction necessitates an expansion of trade routes through each Nation’s territory for Settlers’ access to these resources and more importantly to the land itself. This led to the Chilcotin War and more than 150 years of continued resistance aided by the geography, and the rural and remoteness of the Nation’s location.

After the war, our culture went silent. Our stories and ceremony went underground in order to survive. It has been 150 years since the T̓sílhqot’in War, and the families who are descendants of the six executed chiefs continue to pass on and protect their stories of that time despite the massive impact colonization, incursions into our territory, and smallpox have had on our Nation. It’s time to end this silence and bring together our voices and our ancestral stories about this key time in T̓sílhqot’in history for the health and strength of our communities and our new generations, (Haig Brown – FPCC application, 2020).

These lived experiences of continued resistance shape the lived experience of citizenship for all the T̓sílhqot’in participants, the Settlers interviewed in this research, and many others observed to be ‘in relation’ in some way with the Nation and its peoples. For example, T̓sílhqot’in participants Roger, Rosanna, Annette, Alvin, Francis, and Shirley all refer to the Chilcotin War when describing their own lived experiences with social citizenship. The women spoke of how it had shifted women’s roles and voice within their communities and Nation as the continued “war with the crown” meant that the survivors of the war, of the warrior society’s, are centred or lead. These leaders, the women and community members, carry on these governance processes, practices, and cultural traditions but many times they are forced to do so silently, secretively, and unseen through 150 years of interlocking
oppressions, continued settler colonialism, and lateral violence of internal colonization. Interestingly many of the Tšilhqot’in women also used “warrior” as a descriptor of citizenship based on these shared lived experiences of the last 150 years. Perhaps here it can be argued that use of ‘warrior’ is both tied to notion of being ‘at war’ and to denote the protective silence of the matriarchs that the land title win stirs as women reclaim their roles, their agency, and their power. Since its enactment in 1867 the Indian Act has subjugated and marginalized Indigenous women and adversely impacted Indigenous cultures, systems of governance, societies, and ways of life. This legislation enables continued settler colonialism and combined with the socio-historical experiences shapes the ongoing gendered nature of communities and the Nation. As a result, I sought to centre key female voices both involved directly with the Write to Read BC project and key female Knowledge Keepers in the Nation to go beyond the predominant male centre voices in the colonial record and in current leadership. The challenge will be rooting out the internalized colonialism and the impacts it has and continues to have on governance processes and practices, in “living title” or living citizenship. Again, all of this shifted with the land title win and the journey to full title as affirmed by this landmark case. It led to the establishment of the Tšilhqot’in Negotiations and External Affairs Office and a team of ‘table’ leaders who each have been tasked to work through the transfer of full jurisdiction. The language of devolution is seemingly absent and instead there is a purposeful use of legal rhetoric of re-establishing full jurisdiction. Many feel devolution connotes a time in the journey when jurisdiction(s) is(are) ceded, and for the Tšilhqot’in nothing has been ceded and their Dechen Ts’edilhtan, the laws of their relations, are being voiced again and transcribed, translated, enacted, embodied, and emplaced. As I continue to work in the Nation beyond this research, my role and position continues to engender trust and teachings regarding what it means to be Tšilhqot’in, a ‘citizen of title’, that is more nuanced as perceptions of agency shifts as citizens come together and their voices and stories are heard and valued not silenced as women, and men, reclaim their roles, their relational responsibilities.

For the Indigenous participants in the second case study, it became apparent the continued epistemological, ontological, axiological, and methodological influence on ways of knowing and doing the moiety system had and continues to have. Those that came forward to participate are strong females whose voices provide a gendered view into another space, place, and similar but different socio-historic context. Their stories of how lived experiences of social citizenship are enacted, embodied, and emplaced also provide a glimpse of how colonialism shifts women’s roles, silences women’s voices, and strains the generational
agency of Elders. Inferred is the continuation of advocacy through direct government to government, people to people, negotiations with the foreign power, i.e., the Crown directly in Ottawa or via the colonial courts, for their children via the social construction of systems under continued settler colonialism directed. The geographic location within a capital city also influences the relationship – higher concentration of Settlers and direct access to the federal bureaucrats. Similarly, the Yukon is also unceded territory, but the Yukon First Nations choose to negotiate return of jurisdiction. Land settlement and self-government agreements have been described as ‘devolution’ with the connotation being that they had ‘to cede’ to get back what was always theirs; argued by some to be a sign of internalized colonialism (see Fanon, 1993; Coulthard, 2014; Palmater, 2011; Sellars, 2016 etc.). Both of these socio-historic contexts demonstrate how the legacies of colonialism are internalized, normalized, and/or resisted in culturally responsive ways, and spotlights participants’ agency as resiliency. This is directly associated with the ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing of each Nation in the relational lived and practiced societies or moieties’ governance structures, traditional laws, protocol, and ceremonies that are enacted, embodied, and emplaced via social processes and practices.

7.2 Contextualizing the Comparison of Two CSOs’ Literacy Equity Praxis Indigenized (or not)

The socio-historic context also shapes the places and spaces where Settler and Indigenous interactions occur including the two CSOs under exploration as well as the relationship between said CSOs and abject or marginalized peoples, groups, and communities. As contended in chapter three, CSOs are seen as a spatial phenomenon, a space between the state, market, and family life where a spectrum of social agency occurs through complex webs of relationships, thus the exploration of whose knowledge counts in these interactions of social action and knowledge production is key. Utilizing an intersectional indigeneity approach allows for contested or counter hegemonic narratives and contextual to be teased out of the organizational analysis, observations, and participants perspectives. This section will begin with an organizational and contextual comparison of Rotary International and Write to Read BC and Yukon Child Development Centre and Dusk’a Headstart Learning Centre. Specific attention will be paid to the intersections of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in knowledge production by examining the following: professionalization and privilege of the predominately settlers within each organization, the role of relational connections, and ontological, epistemological, methodological, and axiological praxis (or not).
One of the points of similarity between the two CSOs and the specific sites of interaction is that both have a focus on literacy equity – one is specifically focused on Indigenous literacy while the other’s scope of literacy equity is broader and for all families and children with special needs. During the bounded time for this research, both also are bound to a specific meso level geographic area, either a province or territory, and the exploration is with a specific Indigenous nation. Perhaps of interest in the distinction is how some participants in the second case study perceive this more board scope of services. Many felt the YCDC could do more to address how the continued colonial legacies are addressed and how more service could be provided to the most vulnerable within the communities they serve. One example of this that I will highlight again in this chapter is the physical location of the main centre.

Both CSOs create ‘service teams’ that are made up of all stakeholders. For Write to Read BC the model is to have Rotarians and other skilled professions work with Indigenous community members. At the YCDC the model is to have staff with the family. In each instance under exploration in this research these models of shared representation and responsibility are employed. It is important however to note each organization’s demographic make up within the bounded timeframe of this research. The YCDC staff consists of almost all women (one male bus driver), 90 percent of whom are privileged Settler women with a professional childcare designation. The Dusk’a space comprises of almost 90 percent Indigenous women who are either considered Elders, Knowledge Keepers, or have a professional childcare or related designation. Rotary is almost the mirror opposite in North America, it continues to be a privilege white male professional network; women have been members for just over thirty years and make up roughly a quarter of the members. Write to Read BC project volunteers all have a professional designation, are roughly one third Rotarian, are roughly half female, and approximately one quarter self-identify as First Nations, Inuit, or Métis. In this research it is observed that Settler professional, Rotarians, and childcare staff are paired or partnered with community staff or members as a way to work with. Working with gives voice and agency to the community or individual families through opportunities of mentorship, participation, and power sharing. However, it is important to note that the perceived ‘professionalism’ and the unequal power relations and marginalization can silence Indigenous ways of knowing and doing (Choudry, 2010; Kamat 2004). Both cases also provided counternarratives of how on the other hand not centring ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing leads to praxis that is perceived to abjectify and be a continuation of colonial logics.
In each case there is also connections, and some are relational connections. I am the Rotarian who is partnered with a community for the first Write to Read BC library learning centre which led to being adopted and a lifelong learning journey of the Tšilhqot’in language, laws, protocols, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. The connection to the YCDC was first made possible by my mother and then in Dusk’a by a trusted and respected long-time staff member Marguerite (Settler). These relational connections highlight and keeps in the forefront for me the importance of the relational accountability and responsibility. Being accountable to your relations through respect, reciprocity, and responsibility Wilson (2008) argues is the foundational concept of an Indigenous axiological praxis. Relational accountability and responsibility also focus the comparison on whose knowledge counts and how the socio historic context shapes the places and spaces where interactions and relationships occur, including these CSOs and the Indigenous individuals, groups, and communities. Participants provide examples of lived experiences with both CSOs, particularly within Write to Read BC and Dusk’a, where they felt their knowledge counted. Indigenous participants both praise each CSOs journeys of un/decolonizing service but also provide examples and insight where each could do more or shift certain services or spaces to ease the colonial legacies attached to some processes and practices.

Divergent ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing conceptualized in participants’ lived experience of social citizenship processes and practices of the CSOs praxis, enacting its mission and values are observed. Participants share examples of these divergent lived experiences highlighting how most perceive the CSOs praxis as being in alignment with the organizational mission and values. Both are deemed to be ‘good’ examples of how to un/decolonize services when working with Indigenous individuals, groups, or communities. However, all feel there was room for improvement – especially when it came to cultural awareness and responsiveness. This can be seen in Annette’s (Tšilhqot’in) example of when the dental students are ‘talking’ over a patient and the perception of being ignored, being abjectified, and how continued settler logics like poverty do not always allow Indigenous people to have the same experiences as more privileged Settlers.

They do forget. (laughter) Especially when they are hovering over them and talking to each other and the forget that there is an individual who is underneath them that is totally trusting them, and they are talking and going on about say their holiday trip. I caught two students going, ‘I am really looking forward to going to Europe’, and here is the client underneath them going ‘my
mouth is wide open, and you are talking about that… So afterwards, client shared with me, and I said thank you, and we need to acknowledge that, and I approached the two. I said to them, ‘I know you are really excited about this Europe trip, but it way beyond us. We cannot even imagine going to Vancouver, it is big enough as it is. This Europe trip you are talking about is like going to Vancouver for us.’ So, they look at me and gave me funny looks, but the older of the two went away and thought about it and came back and said, ‘I totally understand’.

The experience and perception of epistemic violence are found in the community members impeded or lack of choice, of equity of choice. It speaks to the social and cultural capital available to them within their own space and place, their community, and their agency as resiliency to speak up. Also, it speaks to Annette (T̓sílhqot’in) role as a matriarch to advocate and teach these young Settler professionals in the making what it means to be relationally responsible and culturally responsive.

Before moving to the comparative analysis of two case studies’ main themes of perceptions and lived experiences of social citizenship (citizenship as rights and reciprocity and as belonging, relational, and spiritual), and CSO as agent. I will provide a brief recap, in the first case there are 24 participants.

7.3 Participants’ perceptions and lived experiences of social citizenship ~ a shared paradigm

Participants’ perceptions and lived experiences of social citizenship are nested within each space and place macro and meso socio-historic context and are examples of hegemonic and counter hegemonic narratives of the national discourse insitu. As seen in the first case study the subjectivities within each expression of the contested concept that is citizenship reflects the interpretations or negotiations of these notions and the complex interconnected interplay of alignments and realignments that formed convergent and divergent views. Also, the second case suggests these subjectivities may indicate these shared perspectives, interactions and interconnections represent a small sample of the spectrum of ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological collision of more than a century of coexisting to form shared experiences of legislated assimilation and acculturation attempts, integrations in shared spaces and places, and accepted and contested devolution and self-determination efforts. By comparing the underlying similarities and differences in a cross-case analysis utilizing intersectional indigeneity, participants’ lived experiences in the counter hegemonic knowledge production spaces and places in both cases (i.e., Write to Read
BC and Dusk’a) highlight how participants frame and reframe social citizenship. This framing and reframing encompass participants’ perceptions of social citizenship: as rights or reciprocity and as belonging, relational or spiritual. This comparison highlights evidence also of participants perceived lived experience of a shared Settler and a shared Indigenous social citizenship paradigm.

Before turning to the comparative analysis of these emergent notions of social citizenship, a short descriptive summary of each case’s findings is provided. The first case had 24 participants who either identify as Tšilhqot’in or Settler and the analysis of their collective perceptions of the lived experience of social citizenship accentuates how the Settler worldview and Tšilhqot’in worldview influence these perceptions of roles, responsibilities, accountabilities, and individual and collective agency. For Settler participants in this case social citizenship is perceived as rights, agreed, and contested, as belonging, as entitlements, as power, as social connections, and as community. Tšilhqot’in participants identify social citizenship as an epistemological and axiological way of relating, a sense of belonging, a role and responsibility, and as something inherently spiritually linked to the land. The second case has 16 participants whose diversity reflects the socio historic context of the space and place and includes Settlers, Kwanlin Dün and other Indigenous worldviews from across North America that are all reflected in the perceptions of participants’ lived experiences of roles and interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in notions of citizenship. Therefore, in this case it is not possible to identify a specific Kwanlin Dün perspective and the summary below is again a reflection of the agreed and contested hegemonic and counter hegemonic narratives that are woven together by shared interactions and interconnections that create shared and overlapping perceptions of the lived experiences of social citizenship in these spaces and places. All participants’ narratives demonstrate the shared perception of citizenship as linked to a sense of belonging and as relational but also how each is enacted, embodied, emplaced, and experienced varies ontological, epistemically, methodologically, and axiologically. Citizenship is seen as a mechanism to define ‘who we are’, as a political identity, as a role and responsibility, as both an internal and external categorization tool, as accountability, and as relational or more specifically as an axiologically and epistemically way of relating (‘being in relation’).

Citizenship as rights, as reciprocity creates spaces and places of both privilege and abjection in both cases. The continued enactment of the Indian Act creates a duality, a legislated divide of citizens based solely on a question of status determined by ethnicity that also persists in gendered epistemic violence against Indigenous women. Lived experiences of
this aspect of social citizenship reflects both the right-based approach that creates an exogenous categorization and frames Indigenous citizens as wards of the state and as sui generis, (i.e., independent, collective, heterogeneous). These socio historic contingencies are still present with the lived experiences of social citizenship, and they include and exclude citizens from political, civic, and economic interaction creating spaces that both privilege and abject through imposed colonial ideologies and practices of exogeneous criteria and imposed assimilation. Participants’ agency of citizenship is synthesized into how their lived experience reflects this continued duality within citizenship rights regimes and the perception of citizenship as a set of rights or entitlements.

Settlers in the first case agree that labeling and racial stereotyping frames the lived experience of social citizenship and citizenship as rights based on exogenous criteria. For June† (Settler), the synchronicity when external labels are used in self-identification both internally and externally become layered, dangerous, essentializing, and a mechanism of othering. The segregation of people through labeling June† (Settler) perceived is geographically exasperated further in rural and remote spaces and places. Settler participants also utilize discursive devices to distance themselves from what they perceived as settler colonial norms in perceptions, behaviours, and actions. Of interest is the lived experience of social citizenship through the lens of the naturalization process to become a citizen. These experiences highlight how recent or first-generation immigrants interviewed in this research are normalized to settler colonial norms and false notions of the homogeneity of Indigenous people. Hegemonic narratives persist and continue to sustain settler colonial relations of power or as Coulthard argues produces and maintains these colonial “fields of power” (2014:17). Settler participants Bob, Nick, and Heather all spoke of how these perceptions are reformed in the un/decolonizing spaces fostered by Write to Read BC that creates opportunities for complex social interactions with Indigenous people and communities that reinforced the heterogeneity of Indigenous peoples’ ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing.

In the first case, both Annette (Tsilhqot’in) and Rosaline (Tsilhqot’in) specifically speak of how this dualism creates abject spaces and abject behaviours based on race and settler privilege, and both speak of the adverse impacts of this racist exogenous labeling and ethnocentrism on their lives, their Nation, and Indigenous people across what is now called Canada. Annette (Tsilhqot’in) implies that being labeled as a “community of fearful savages” and the persistence of this view of Indigenous people in the lived experience of social citizenship draws attention to how it also persists in the national discourse. Their lived
experience also highlights the contingencies of knowledge production within this sociohistoric context and demonstrates how colonialism has simply morphed to fit the contemporary context. Therefore, I would argue once again as many scholars do, there is nothing post about colonialism in Canada (i.e., Lowman & Barker, 2015; Coulthard, 2014; Holmes, Hunt & Piedalue, 2014; Hunt 2014). Problematizing the context as one of continued settler colonialism and reframing these lived experiences of citizenship as rights to be socio-political or social-civil abjection and to be of what Fricker (2007 reprint 2010) argues is continued epistemic injustice. The socio-historic context in conjunction with these exclusionary and marginalizing lived experiences of Tšilhqot’in participants creates contingencies of meaning and perceptions of Settlers as racist, entitled, hierarchical, pedantic, patriarchal, sperate, dismissive, and disrespectful. These perceptions are linked for participants to continued settler colonial logics, intergenerational trauma, and internalized colonialism. For Roger (Tšilhqot’in) these perceptions stem from being “taken away” as children and “segregated” from family and the land as well as colonial violence of not being allowed to speak the language and openly practice the culture. Tšilhqot’in participants’ lived experiences also demonstrates the integration of Settler ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing into their communities.

Perceptions are that little to nothing has changed in the relations between Indigenous and Settler people and will not change until sui generis rights are acknowledged and enacted, embodied, and emplaced. However, as Clay’s (Tšilhqot’in) perceptions highlight some Settlers are seen as allies, as key professionals in the battle for title and social service provision in rural and remote underserved spaces and places. The role of exclusion and role of rurality are also linked by Steven (Sto:lo) to legal and geographical segregation and separation of citizens. These continued epistemic injustices highlight how continued settler colonialism persists creating opportunities for abjection, over reliance on external Settler agencies, or what Satzewich and Wotherspoon (2000) argue is another form of assimilation through urbanization. I argue all of these deflate the institutional imputeus for governments to fully fund community or Nation based services and capacity building. All of this leads to what Shirley (Tšilhqot’in) and Tiara (Tšilhqot’in) describe as a continued caution in interaction with Settlers and to the axiological importance of trust and respect in citizenship processes and practices as well as opportunities for participation, partnership, and power sharing.

In the second case, participants share how citizenship as rights processes and practices can include and exclude within the same space and place. This is demonstrated by the lived
experiences of participants of the political dimension of agency and the level of inclusion observed to directly impact whose knowledge counts, and what opportunities are present for participation, partnerships, and power sharing. For example, inferred from Alayne’s (Settler) lived experience of social citizenship is that her perception of citizenship as rights is shaped by her settler-centric privileged professional position. It allows her to have the agency, to take part, and to share in the local political dimension of agency while inferring the connection between having rights to one’s sense of belonging, access, and equitable inclusion without being solely defined by acculturative discriminatory legislation, or in her words “the government piece”. For her, it is simultaneously also shaped by the land settlement and self-government agreement process which fosters spaces and places that create further opportunities for her professional experience of working in and with First Nations communities across the Yukon. The positive impact is the development of cultural sensitivity and the acknowledgement of Indigenous ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing in the YCDC’s service delivery, partnership development, and power sharing opportunities.

Similarly, inferred from Rachel’s (Settler) lived experience is the interplay of intersubjectivities in belonging with responsibilities to citizenship as rights’ processes and practices that demonstrate how some citizens have the agency to take part and to share in the political power while others do not or have limited or exogenously defined access. Whose knowledge counts has bearing on agency or the capacity to take part or advocate for oneself or others and links social justice and notions of equity; in this case, to social service delivery for marginalized families of children with alter-abilities. Settler participants also all acknowledge the key role of indigenous self-determination and the 30-year process of land settlement agreements for the shifts in relationship and the differentiation of lived experience of social citizenship. This can be seen in terms of Settler concepts of “success” and capacities for reciprocity and advocacy as they intersect with the socio historic, political, cultural, and economic contexts to create spaces and places that simultaneously privilege and abject. Here agency as praxis in the political dimensions is the capacity, as Lister (2014) argues, for citizens to enact rights in accordance with existing culture and social structures.

The Indigenous participants in the second case articulate a clear link between rights and responsibilities and frame them, similarly to the first case, as relationally tied to the land; this will be discussed in more detail in subsection on citizenship as relational. Indigenous participants in this case have similar lived experience of social citizenship as the result of macro and meso colonial infrastructure and material interventions. In this space and place there is also nothing “post” about colonialism, and continued settler colonialism is perceived
and observed to persist in adversely impacting matrilineal rights and the relational rights of the collective. Participants’ lived experience of citizenship as rights has a common thread of imposed colonial ideologies, processes, and practices that shape who is what kind of citizen as well as perceptions of rights and responsibilities or reciprocities that both privilege and abject. In this case the discussions often focus on what, if any, changes do the land settlement and self government agreements create within the spaces and places in this case study to un/decolonize and to mitigate the colonial legacies and continued settler colonialism logics. Similarly, aspects of citizenship and knowledge production are different given the heterogenous subjectivities in participants’ lived experience of citizenship as rights. For example, Kona (Indigenous) describes the importance of the symbolism of participating in the process of monetary exchange under her peoples’ Treaty with the Crown. It is not about the money but powering sharing and ensuring the Treaty is “active and alive” as the symbol of her rights “as a Treaty person” to return to her peoples’ land always. Her lived experience of this aspect is nested and complex emphasizing agency as praxis, as the enactment and accountability of these rights. It can also be inferred as acculturation and an example of the link between agency and abjection as Kona (Indigenous) is both simultaneously agent of indigeneity and colonized subject.

In both cases the discursive device of shifting to use the particle “with” is viewed as a tactic or tool in the process of un/decolonizing social service delivery within indigenized spaces and places through infrastructural and material interventions. This discursive tool is one also of inclusion, a principle Choudry and Kapoor (2010) argue is essential to the politics of knowledge production, decolonization, and rights equity. Indigenous and Settler participants in both cases lived experiences of citizenship as rights implies differential positioning in perceptions of how continued settler colonial logics and attitudes can led to social distress and change that are often miss-framed and mistaken for social and cultural collapse. Citizenship as rights can both privilege and marginalize as seen in the complex social relations and intersections that underscore how intersubjective effects of social citizenship processes and practices are formed and influence agency. Therefore, re-problematizing the context to one of continued settler colonialism allows again for a reframing of these interaction as fostering both agency and abjection. It allows for Coulthard (2014) argues a critical examination of negotiated structural and material change in a continued settler colonial context to discern true un/decolonizing processes and practices from persistent thinly veiled colonial epistemic violence.
Citizenship as belonging is inferred as a practical way to construct a political way to identify or situate oneself as a citizen individually or collectively, a form of attachment and social identity. Participants’ lived experience of belonging foregrounds perceptions of self in relation and self in relation to others that are built upon a specific epistemological grounded praxis based on diverse cultural norms that lead to different actions and protocols, to different processes and practices. In the first case, Bob (Settler) and Scott’s (Settler) lived experience as professional Settler men of privilege (retired police officer and architect) of this epistemological grounded process reflects the settler-centric national discourse in situ. This is altered by their experiences of working with Indigenous peoples and communities demonstrating to them both the multiplicity of meanings of this praxis. It also reveals the dual notions of belonging, of inclusion and exclusion or privilege and abjection, which is also further linked to notions of self-recognition and of equity. For many Settler participants in this case, belonging is connected to citizenship as reciprocity and responsibilities as the two are perceived to be woven together relationally and temporally through the connections of shared experiences. Through these shared connections and experiences, as Ron (Settler) and Judith (Settler) assert, the duality of citizenship as belonging requires truth telling, grace, and making/giving space to abjectified voices and counter hegemonic narratives.

Tsilhqot’in participants’ perceptions of belonging are all grounded in a Tsilhqot’in worldview and the intergenerational histories, relationship, and connection to the land. Shirley’s (Tsilhqot’in) lived experience of belonging focuses this notion of social citizenship on the relational processes and practices that are also axiologically grounded in respect and reciprocity that is collective, converging on family, community, and the land. Clay (Tsilhqot’in) shares how Tsilhqot’in experiences of belonging are nested or layered creating a citizenship of belonging that for him was filtered through perceptions of the intersubjective reality of micro, meso, and macro integration and interactions created by the reality of legislative duality, colonial legacies, and continued settler colonialism. This includes the land via the colonial logics and material reality, a persistent mechanism of isolation as perceived by Steven (Sto:lo) and a mechanism of power that sustains colonial relations and continued settler colonialism as argued by Hunt (2014) and Coulthard (2014).

In the second case, similarly Rachel (Settler) and Sarah (Settler) are privileged settler women and skilled professions who worked with marginalized families and communities and as such have experienced citizenship as belonging as ‘being a part of’. However, working with Indigenous communities through the YCDC also altered their experiences and perceptions of their own and other Settlers’ epistemological grounded praxis. They both
acknowledge the normalization via public and local educational systems of colonial infused perceptions and national myths that continue to create spaces and places of abjection. Again, this duality of privilege and abjection speaks to the heterogeneity of experiences and perceptions within the Yukon, to whose knowledge counts, and the unstated underlying interlocking oppressions like racism or sexism. Thus, these Settler narratives of citizenship as belonging highlight the continued need to maintain relationships and interconnections to build empathy and understanding of others who have a different way of knowing and doing. It speaks as well to the continued need to un/decolonize education and literacy services to address the prevalent unspoken racialized abjection that disallows for the full acknowledgement and acceptance of indigenous difference and indigenous self-determination. For some of the professional privileged Settler women interviewed and observed, un/decolonizing and the shifting of one’s epistemological grounded praxis is a struggle. Some are committed to acknowledging the dualism of agency and abjection in whose knowledge counts and some still display a “thinly veiled ‘white saviour’ complex”. It is important to note that a few of the Settler parents who are interviewed also experience abjection due to labeling as a result of ableism, and for some it fosters a sense of belonging and creates agency or abjectified or both.

Unlike the first case, Indigenous participants are not homogeneous but are all linked in their shared lived experiences of YCDC and Kwanlin Dün or Dusk’a. These nested narratives are tied to both the space and place of the territory but also to the ontological and epistemological ground praxis of each participant’s kin group(s) and Nation(s). The lived experience of citizenship as belonging is complex and nested as Jolene’s (Indigenous) experience tied her to both her home territory and the community she belongs to and lives in creating a relational space of reciprocity. Her impression of Kwanlin Dün “helping everyone” can be linked socio-historically to how moieties use shared space and resources to negotiate and to create collaborative co-existence with other Indigenous peoples and Nations. It also highlights again the positive and negative lived experiences of the impacts of the land settlement agreements and how they foster both a sense of belonging but also abjectified those who fall as Jolene (Indigenous) says, “in the middle”. Shifting from the place of her kin, her moiety for her means citizenship as belonging is perceived as a place of relational reciprocity and is about “citizenship as security; knowing you have a place”, of being ‘in-relation’ to something bigger creating nested notions of belonging that have multiple meanings and can be experienced simultaneously. This nested multiple simultaneous experiences of citizenship as belonging are also echoed by other Indigenous participants and
demonstrate the intersubjectivities within the perceptions and experiences of self-in relation, of citizenship as belonging.

For example, both Amber (Indigenous) and Stacey’s (Indigenous) lived experiences speak of acculturation through proximity, but each experienced this in quite different ways. Amber (Indigenous) reconnects to her indigeneity through the sense of belonging she feels in her husband’s family and on his traditional territory. Stacey (Indigenous) acknowledges she belongs to the world as “a global citizen” implying a possible acculturation by proximity and urbanization of epistemological perspectives of citizenship as well as the indigenized notions of self in relation or all my relations. Acculturation, even subtle can also denote as Fanon argues internalized colonialism and is fostered through these types of urbanized social interactions that as Coulthard (2014) argues can have positive and negative effects on individual’s agency. Similarly, in this case notions of ‘self in relation’ and ‘collective in relation’ are expressed simultaneously as citizenship as belonging. They linked to being ‘of the land’, as Coulthard argues, as intrinsically a spiritual experience. In this case, one that is also nested within the hegemony of Indigenous ontological and epistemological ground praxis that also includes interconnectedness, relational reciprocity, and relational responsibilities. Citizenship as belonging is thus both an attempt to occupy and create a sense of place that is tied to kin, land, and relational connection to “all my relations”, that is shaped and reshaped over time within the context of continued settler colonialism.

Citizenship as relational in both cases centres around the divergent and convergent views of and relationship with the land as well as the denial of inherent right in the context of a continued settler colonial state, as highlighted above. Wolfe’s (1999) work demonstrates the net of interrelated meanings inherent within the settler-colonial discourse centre around colonialism primary objective the land, i.e., come, conquer, and create community. Participants’ lived experience of citizenship as relational in both cases also underscores what some scholars (i.e., Lowman & Barker, 2015; Coulthard, 2014; Battiste & Semaganis, 2002; Tully, 2008; Wilson, 2008; Wolfe, 1999) argue is the core difference between Indigenous and Settler citizens: the relationship to the land and how the land in turn shapes ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological concepts of self in relation. The relationship with the land in these unceded territories under examination is subject to settler colonial policies of land claims and rights that morphed into persistent colonial logics of ideological control.

In the first case, Settler participants all recognize the unequal relationships that continued settler colonialism fosters, and all acknowledged that there are place-based
contextual language specific social citizenship process and practices in place before the arrival of Settlers. Tšilhqot’in participants express how dispossession of their lands has adverse consequences on their culture and way of life as reserves are mechanism of control, as are the external labels and legal precedents, the imposed policies, and land claims and rights of the continued settler colonial state. For Roger (Tšilhqot’in) and Shirley (Tšilhqot’in), the continued settler discourse and mechanism of control persist to control both the first peoples and the land. Controlling the narrative allows for this mechanism and discursive devices of discrimination to persist, as seen in Shirley’s (Tšilhqot’in) example of how external ontological and epistemological perspectives are imposed and lead to misunderstandings of ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. “Our people were free to move season to season. We were not nomadic”; seasonal rounds continue to be an expression of self in relation to the land. Thus, for Shirley (Tšilhqot’in), it is what being a Tšilhqot’in citizen is and its intrinsically relationally tied to the land; for her, rights and responsibilities are collective and relational. For Francis (Tšilhqot’in), the land is also a source of cultural strength and connection, the living entity that sustains the Tšilhqot’in people and the place and space of their collective narratives of self in relation. The title case in effect provides an avenue to present this counter narrative of Tšilhqot’in notions of citizenship as relational and the opportunity for them to re-emerge, un/decolonize, and reimagine while reinforcing Tšilhqot’in knowledge systems; it is a time of cultural awakening. Until full title for all Tšilhqot’in lands is enacted, embodied, and emplaced, dispossession and limited access will continue to have, as Perret (2000) and Nettheim (1998) both argue, consequences for their culture and way of life. Francis (Tšilhqot’in) perceives his continue advocacy for full title as his right to decolonizing praxis on the land and to use the court to fight for said right and title. The perception is that land title is a battle win but until full decolonization and title are achieved the “war against the Crown will continue”. Further, Rosaline’s (Tšilhqot’in) lived experience of title demonstrates how the win creates an observable shift in self confidence and positive notions of self in relation, actualization of political agency, and indigeneity praxis. Finally, Roger (Tšilhqot’in) perceives the title win and these shifts as “medicine” for the historical and persistent colonial impacts. Time will tell the full impacts of the title win on these relational aspects of citizenship for both Tšilhqot’in and Settler citizens via the land and jurisdictional shifts of power (or not) as well as opportunities for participation, partnership, and power sharing previously denied under colonial logics and material mechanisms.
In the second case, Settler perspectives similarly acknowledge the unequal relationship and pre-existing place-based contextual language specific social citizenship process and practices. The geography, mythology of “the North”, and the land settlement agreement process also adds layers to the Settler participants’ perspectives and lived experience of citizenship as relational. For example, Marie (Settler) and Rachel (Settler) both perceive relational citizenship as being “part of” or “participation in” the community and that citizenship as relational is ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological grounded in the relational reciprocity of the space and place. Settler participants also recognize that being “part of” a community meant either the “come from aways” who build their own families and connections in a perceived place of isolation and those who have “been here forever and who have a huge sense of community, and a huge sense of family”. This recognition of the role of land in relationships is also seen in the Settler participants acknowledgement of the role of the land settlement and self-government agreements in relationships and the perceived effects on the lived experience of citizenship as relational within the territory and at the sites of investigation. Alayne’s (Settler) lived experience provides a caution in taking lessons from the YCDC and exporting them to other spaces and places without acknowledging the impact of the “proximity” to Whitehorse and the impact of the 30-year process of the land settlement and self-government agreements in the development of relationships and opportunities because of the “direct connection” that creates opportunities for participation, partnerships, and power sharing. Douglas (Settler) also expresses the need for consideration of space and place and sociohistorical context. His direct involvement in the land settlement and self-government agreement process throughout the 30-year process also leads him to recognize the difference in lived experience of citizens. In his perception the process creates a space for learning from past mistakes, a more inclusive place, a sense of pride and increased self-confidence, an opportunity for revitalizing language and culture, and a different perception of government-to-government relations. He also states it was not easy, “relationships are hard work” and power sharing, “‘who’ controls what”, whose knowledge counts, is continually negotiated and contested. It must also be recognized that the land settlement and self-government agreements are in some cases also still being judicially decided.

Relational reciprocity, or citizenship as relational, for the Indigenous participants is grounded in, as it is in the first case, the land. The nuance in lived experiences are observed because of the heterogeneity of ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological similarities and difference in each participants indigeneity as praxis. For the Indigenous
participants in this case citizenship as relational is, as in the first case, relational reciprocity in action grounded on the land, but also in the relationships formed on the land prior to and since contact. Wanda (Indigenous) highlights this as her lived experience of the relational aspects of citizenship that are for her tied to the social relationship with and on the land. Thus, relational yet autonomous governance relationships are required (Fleras & Maaka, 2010) and key to self-determination (Palmater, 2015). Counter narratives to the land settlement and self-government agreements of some of the Indigenous participants draw attention to how the context of continued settler colonialism persists in these contested tools of concession and compromise despite oral and historical evidence that the land is unceded and central to expression of self in relation or citizenship as relational. As in the first case, citizenship processes and practices are reflected in the narratives of the land that teach respect for relationships to others and to the land itself enacted through consensus and relational responsibilities that are for all the Indigenous women interviewed seen as citizenship as relational, their indigeneity as praxis. Despite the contested nature and counter narratives, the land settlement and self-government agreements are simultaneously perceived to also be spaces of agency and indigeneity praxis, of connection and reconnection, of learning, of understanding, and potentially of decolonization and reconciliation. For Indigenous participants Amber, Lyndsay, and Stacey the diverse demographics of the territory reinforces the lived experience of the axiological importance of interconnectedness to the land. Despite the flaws the land settlement and self-government agreement process had, it creates relational and reciprocal spaces that enable these women to feel a sense of belonging on another’s traditional territory, a sense of relational responsibilities to this land and self in relation in this space and place, and a developed sense of agency as resilience as seen in the use of humour to deflect persistent discrimination and micro aggressions. Throughout both cases participants’ lived experience of citizenship as relational reflects perspectives, both Indigenous and Settler, of the land and to self in relation to the land that is shaped by the acknowledged persistent continued settler colonialism.

Citizenship as spirituality is also complex and nested in the notions of how you know what you know. It has a multiplicity of dimensions from how spirituality is conceived and practiced to how it influences worldview, knowledge production, the ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing of self and self in relation (to ancestors, kin, community, the land, the cosmos, and the socio historic context), and thus perceptions and conceptions of citizenship. Language informs epistemological understanding of ways of knowing and doing; and therefore, I again reflexively acknowledge epistemological understanding in both cases is
limited by my lack of language skills. Based on this acknowledgement, the following comparative analysis of the spiritual praxis is limited to what I observe and what is shared within the counter narratives of predominantly the Indigenous participants. Settler participants in both cases are not observed nor did they articulate specific notions of citizenship as spirituality, but that is not to say said notions are not present within Settler cosmoologies or how they are conceived and practiced. Continued settler colonialism is influenced by the historic worldview through the two papal writs and mistrust of Settler institutions of spirituality, the churches, and clergy persist as a result of the Indian Residential School legacy and continued intergenerational trauma. These colonial logics and material mechanism of colonialism also persist in influencing a settler-centric worldview and the structuring of colonial institutions and systems, many of which still discriminate under continued settler colonialism. They are perceived to be entitlement of settler privilege and rights given the generations that have already been here prior to colonization.

Tsilhqot’in participants’ lived experience of citizenship as spirituality on the other hand is seen as both the conceptualization and actualization of traditional and cultural processes and practices in the language, i.e., blessings, songs, and ceremony, and as essential to what it means to be a Tsilhqot’in citizen. Annette (Tsilhqot’in) and Rosaline’s (Tsilhqot’in) lived experience of this spirituality are found within respecting the generational knowledge of Elders and Knowledge Keepers as well as fluent language speakers. Loss of language fluency for Tsilhqot’in citizens is a result of these colonial legacies, a loss experienced by all Indigenous language groups in the Pacific Northwest. Thus, the implied importance of what Annette (Tsilhqot’in) and Rosaline (Tsilhqot’in) share about this respect. For, even when translated into English the respect for generational knowledge enables the continued assurance that the actions of citizens are grounded in Tsilhqot’in spiritual praxis built upon Tsilhqot’in epistemological and ontological foundations as a right of their citizenship. A right denied until the title case and still denied in some spaces in places in the context of continued settler colonialism. For Roger (Tsilhqot’in), citizenship is centred on Tsilhqot’in ontology and the axiological foundation of “respect; living it is citizenship”. His epistemologically grounded praxis, the processes and practices of citizenship, are perceived to be imbued with ceremony and thus spirituality. Here the conceptualization and actualization of “living it” is argued to be an act of agency, and in the context of continued settler colonialism also an act of agency as resiliency, and of resistance. Again, as with the previous concept of belonging, citizenship as spirituality has the dual capacity to oppress or free, to privilege or abject.
One of the differences in the second case is the articulation of colonial mythology in the way some Settler participants’ lived experiences of space and place align with a continued settler colonial ontological and epistemological perception of citizenship, the spirit of it, and its connection to the notion of settler certainty. This settler certainty is observed to have a transformative effect on how this now shared space and place is perceived which did not embrace notion of citizenship as spirituality. Instead, it includes narratives of the ‘north’ that create real and imagined spaces of privilege and abjection. Again, in this case, citizenship as spirituality for Indigenous participants’ lived experience is centred around the principle of “all my relations” that infusing epistemologically grounded praxis with an interconnected holistic spirituality inherent with the languages and stories. Nested subjectivities or counter narratives of the sense of welcoming expressed in the lived experiences of the Indigenous participants who are not Kwanlin Dün demonstrates that unlike the Settler narratives, they acknowledge that this welcome does not in and of itself constitute a spiritual link to the land or kin. The sense of spiritual belonging, or citizenship as spirituality, as a relational interconnectedness with the land, as Kona (Indigenous) states comes from “who you are and where you are from”. Acculturation, forced relocation, and the intergenerational impacts of colonial legacies experienced are expressed by all the Indigenous participants and to some degree create some form of disconnection to kin and the land, to the spiritual. When this interconnected land-based sense of belonging tied to language, cultural, and citizenship processes and practices is forced underground or not transmitted via matriarchical kinship systems predominate among the Indigenous people of what is now the Yukon it creates a space for abjection and fear, mistrust, and interruption of natural societal generational development. These dual realities of connection and disconnection not only create a space for abjection but also agency as resiliency.

For example, Barb’s (Indigenous) lived experience clearly shows how macro level legislations and that intergenerational impacts of these colonial legacies and continued settler colonialism means she does not trust anyone with the care of her daughter. In her own words these colonial logics have her “paranoid” of the continued epistemic injustice that is the lived experience of too many Indigenous women and children; for her there is nothing “post” about colonialism. Nested within her social and political positioning is her expression also of agency as resiliency in her lived, practiced, and relational indigeneity. This is expressed in how Barb (Indigenous) perceives and enacts her ontological and spiritual right to connect to the land as a way to mitigate the impacts of persistent epistemic violence of continued settler colonialism. It is the expression of her relational accountability between self and the land or
her citizenship as spirituality. Amber’s (Indigenous) nested narrative is also an expression of her political agency and example of agency as resiliency as her lived experience of the continued epistemic violence against Indigenous women across North America because of colonial logics and material interventions; she was an Indigenous child adopted into a white family and describes it as a feeling of being “torn in half”. Implied in her narrative is how this persistent epistemic violence left her searching for a sense of self and a sense of identity as she is told “no, you’re white because you act like this”. She speaks of the healing of the trauma of epistemic injustice through the lived experience of her husband’s family, the healing of matriarchy that creates a sense of inclusion through grandmothers and aunties, and a sense of belonging through connection. For Amber (Indigenous) her lived experience of social citizenship “here”, in this space and place of her husband’s kin, is rooted in this spiritual interconnection and relational experience grounded in her connection to this land through her inclusion in the epistemologically grounded praxis of her husband’s people. Jolene’s (Indigenous) narrative furthers demonstrates how the connection between her cultural epistemologically grounded praxis, language, and the land are nested in her expression of citizenship as spirituality. The potlach house for her is the physical representation of the spiritual aspects of citizenship, the sacred processes and practices. For Jolene (Indigenous), it is the interrelatedness of all things that constitutes the spirituality of citizenship and interrelatedness of all things is reflected for her in the sacred space of the Nakwat’a Kuu Potlach House and in how the new village itself is laid out. The spiritual praxis of Nakwat’a Kuu Potlach House, with my reflexively acknowledged limitations, is as a sacred community space that is a physical representation of this praxis, a space where the social, political, and spiritual interconnect in accordance with the relational nature of the moieties and clans. Similar to the first case, participants’ articulation, abstractions and actualizations, their citizenship as spirituality is seen as their right as citizens, a right that was illegal under the Indian Act and that continues to be denied in many spaces and places under continued settler colonialism logics and material practices.

Both cases demonstrate the axiological roots of these spiritual aspects of the processes and practices of social citizenship that are tied to the land and to specific sacred spaces. These spaces are where the spiritual meets the social and where Indigenous citizens are freed from colonial oppressions. Social citizenship knowledge production as Hunt (2013) argues is ontologically, epistemological, axiological, and methodologically interconnected, and as Lincoln and Guba (2000) argue citizenship is “a profoundly spiritual concern” (p.169). It is also place specific grounded indigeneity and becomes an example of the politics of
knowledge. The lived experience of social citizenship is where participants’ ways of being, their ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing is interconnected and interrelated and enacted, embodied, and emplaced, or not. Both cases also lay bare lived experiences of nested narratives of agency as resilience through spiritual (re)connections that are in relation, inter-relational, and place specific that are juxtaposed with concurrent lived experiences situated within the socio-historic context of the political realities of the problematized context of settler colonialism.

In the next section the unit of comparative analysis shifts to the organization to explore the similarities, differences, and the confounding interesting perspectives on the axiological praxis of Rotary and Write to Read BC and YCDC and the Dusk’a partnership.

7.4 The Space Between: Comparing CSOs as agents in axiological praxis

Space and place play a role in CSO as agent with the capacity to ensure organization rhetoric and action are culturally responsive. In both cases, these spaces and places are perceived by participants to be culturally responsive. They are also perceived to provide opportunities for interactions, for sharing counter narratives of lived experiences, and for participation, partnership, and power sharing that is inferred to build trust, understanding, empathy, and potential bridges for un/decolonizing and reconciliation. Indigenous participants in both cases raise critiques around communication, embodied Settler professional privilege, continued advocacy for increased services, and need for persistent un/decolonizing and reconciliation praxis of both organizations. Simultaneously they acknowledge the cultural competencies of both Write to Read BC and Dusk’a. In the first case, Settler participants universally recognize the necessity to be relationally and culturally responsive especially considering the reality of rural and remote service delivery. Settler participants also recognize their ignorance of local knowledge production because of continued settler colonial logics and normalization through education of settler-centric national discourse. By participating in community events and working with community members at the sites under investigation (and other spaces and places in their professional careers), Settler participants all speak of the power of indigeneity praxis. They all speak of how incorporating indigenous difference creates spaces for participation that reinforces a sense of belonging and shared power via literacy equity action that by-passes governmental bureaucracy to create an inferred counter narrative to the lived reality of abjection of continued settler colonialism. This is why the critiques of Indigenous participants regarding communication shed light on how the negotiation, the communication, and decision making, as Fleras and Maaka (2010) argue, are key to transferring power and authority and for
creating a space of indigeneity praxis. Indigeneity praxis enables an agent to reflexively interpret their own lived experience in their own voice and is inferred in the first case to be key to direct non-colonial action that is seen as citizen to citizen. Clay (Tsilhqot’in) perceives the axiological enactment of values of honesty, trust, and working with the community in his lived experience of Write to Read BC enabling the negotiation of shared power and ownership for the joint library learning centre project. Settler professional privilege continues to be a challenge to un/decolonizing processes and responses of some of Write to Read BC’s members and partners. However, by continually enacting the axiological principle of adhering to an indigeneity praxis and honouring Indigenous community’s ways means the community shares the power and guilds the project’s framing for participation. Write to Read BC thus is inferred to be a potential space within a predominately privileged white organization of inclusion via social political non-colonial relations.

In the second case, Settler participants also recognize the impacts of continued settler colonialism on rural and remote service delivery and how it often necessitates relocation to the urban space like the capital. The role of trust is key as is the acknowledgement of persistent uncertainties of settler institutions. CSO as agent can foster knowledge exchanges between the privilege and the abject to build shared experiences that build trust and understanding. The YCDC is perceived to create spaces and places for nested intersecting lived experiences of social citizenship. For Settler participants Alayne, Douglas, Sarah, and Rachel YCDC’s agency is perceived in the everyday enactment of organizational actions that creates safe spaces of inclusion, opportunities of interactions, and reduces barriers as organizational values are turned into social action either directly or via advocacy with families, partnering organizations, and communities. The socio historic context with regard to Settler professionals or the “come from aways” is observed to be reflected in their perceived relational responsiveness and responsibility as professionals. It is also observed in how in these roles they negotiate or advocate; both ‘on behalf of’ to other levels of government and service providers as well as ‘with’ marginalized families through mentorship and self advocacy capacity building. For both Marie (Settler) and Rachel (Settler) advocacy is also about whose knowledge counts and families need to be a part of the social action as they are mentored to build the capacities to advocate for themselves. This for Kate (Settler) is key to her relocating her family for service she perceives to be “genuine, honest, compassionate”, where her and her family’s voice and knowledge count and they are a part of the CSO’s knowledge production and social action. This for Alayne (Settler) and Sarah (Settler) is due to the CSO agency in creating a space and place of inclusion, acknowledging the temporal
and generational factors to undoing normalized racialized perspectives, building Board and staff awareness of socio historic context and persistent impacts of continued settler colonialism, and fostering culturally responsive spaces and partnerships. This is inferred to be the type of “political advocacy” fostered by the CSO as agent that Hulme and Edwards (1997) argue creates opportunities for relational responsibility and participation.

Similar to the first case, Indigenous participants also perceive the CSO as agent’s relational responsiveness and responsibility to be a micro, meso, and macro level asset. Participants infer that the development of strengthened relationships are based on a shared understanding of divergent lived experiences of social citizenship via an axiological indigeneity praxis. Again, trust, compassion, and in this case being present in and working with the community are perceived in advancing un/decolonizing early childhood education and localizing services over decades of interaction. It is also inferred from participants’ lived experience that indigeneity and agency enable alternative knowledges to count and be centred and thus social action legitimized. Indigenous participants Kona, Amber, and Chantelle all perceive the YCDC axiological alignment to be inclusive, to be diverse, and to foster empathy and reciprocity is juxta posed with their own generative power, strained agency, material resources, and socio historical barriers in relation to the ability to participate as a result of the structural inequities of continued settler colonialism. As Jolene’s (Indigenous) and Wanda’s (Indigenous) lived experiences of persistent abjection as Indigenous women and Elders also underscore that within the context of continued settler colonialism there persists a mistrust of institutions, intergenerational trauma, forced relocations, strained sense of belonging, and strained agency. It is also argued that the counter hegemonic narrative of un/decolonizing requires culture and language revitalization with resources and mentoring, self and professional development to rebuild knowledge, capacities, and skills, as well as spaces and places to be indigenized, normalized, and legitimized. In this case communication and settler professional privilege are also critiqued, and as Amber (Indigenous) suggests an indigeneity praxis through continuing un/decolonizing and indigenizing spaces where multiple modes of communication coexist honouring both the relational and professional discourses is needed. An indigeneity praxis here is inferred as turning the organizational language into action as an example of how to make service delivery more responsive and relational in this specific space and place. The caution being lessons from this case may or may not be duplicable in other space and place and would have to be localized.

Lived experience shapes a citizen’s agency. Participation, partnership, and power sharing processes and practices transform the subjectivities strengthening the development of
political agency as Lister (2004) argues. This is inferred in participants’ lived experiences of CSO as agent fostered interactions of Indigenous and Settler citizens, both privileged and marginalized or abjectified.

7.5 Thematic comparison: knowledge production, lived experience, and agency

Comparatively there are both many similarities and some striking differences or points of interest in both cases but overall, this comparative analysis shows how continued settler colonialism both privileges and marginalizes participants while fostering activism and the continued pursuit of recognition, reestablishment, and reinstatement of sovereignty. Knowledge production is imbued with agency within the intersecting often blurred concurrent experiences, that both privilege and abject, of participation, partnerships, and power sharing that are often nested, especially for Indigenous participants. Counter and nested narratives of indigenous difference and indigenous self-determination in both spaces and places concurrently create a sense of belonging and sense of disconnection due to continued settler colonialism and intergenerational trauma. These are further confounded by generational and gendered subjectivities as seen in the shared experiences Indigenous women of violence experienced in both case and the disclosed Elder abuse in the second case. Through these comparisons emerges a shared Settler paradigm and a shared Indigenous paradigm.

Knowledge production in both cases is complex and multi-layered, a collection of lived and embodied, blurred and nested, hegemonic and counter-hegemonic narratives of agency. In the first case it is about reframing the narrative to undo the systematic removal and replacement of the Tšilhqot’in worldview and systems that are being reinstated and reimagined post title. Similarly, in the second case, agency is also about shifting and reframing the narrative to share power through devolution of jurisdiction inherent within the land settlement and self-government agreements. An intersectional indigeneity comparative analysis of knowledge production is again focused on notions of intersection: indigenous difference, indigenous rights, indigenous belonging, indigenous self-determination, and indigenous spirituality as well as agency as resiliency.

Indigenous difference in the shared lived experience of the Tšilhqot’ín participants centres around the acknowledgement and exoneration of the Tšilhqot’in War Chiefs as warriors, not murderers, and the inherent unceded rights and title of the Nation and its citizens. Fundamentally it is about the inclusion of a multiplicity of diverse knowledges into the lived experience of social citizenship and its discourse. Similarly, in the Yukon, and for Kwanlin Dün Nation indigenous difference is also centred on this inclusivity, on giving voice
to the often-silenced nested heterogeneity of lived, practiced, and relational knowledges. This honouring of the heterogeneity of ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing in both cases are reflected and contested within the intersections of citizens both Indigenous and Settler in the space and places the CSOs create. These intersections are about power sharing, participation, and partnerships. Through the avenue of Write to Read BC, participants perceive power sharing to be about shared responsibility and accountability of the work within each community and thus working with or together to tackle social challenges. In this case, it is about literacy and dental health literacy inequity related to community access to resources, space, and services. This case study demonstrates how an Indigenous community’s agency and power are constrained by these service and material resources inequalities that are the ongoing legacies of continued settler colonialism. Intersections between Settlers and Indigenous participants in the shared narratives of Write to Read BC show how it is community led to co-create spaces and places of literacy and health equity within the community. As Clay (Tšíllhqot’in) points out, this shared responsibility or “sweat equity”, how much power, accountability, and responsibility community members perceived they have is linked to “how much they participate”. Also, this caution to take part, the silence, the wait and observe first community attitude, is linked to the socio-historic contexturals, continued colonial legacies and intergenerational traumas, ensuing mistrust, and the historic relationship with ‘outsiders’. Silence does not always mean complacency or agreement; it can also imply caution and mistrust. Therefore, partnerships are informal, and the community leads as a power sharing process that helps build trust by honouring in this case Tšíllhqot’in ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing to address the colonial legacies of lack of services within community. In essence processes and practices are localized and indigenized.

This notion of working with as a power sharing mechanism is also seen in the second case where all participants, both Indigenous and Settler, remark that YCDC achieves axiological praxis of “working with” both individual families and the community. In this case partnership and participation are more specifically about trust and centring families’ knowledge. Participants imply that this participation in power sharing partnership is key to co-creating spaces and places where a multiplicity of knowledges, and for Indigenous participants also indigenous difference, are honoured in culturally responsive shared processes and practices. For Indigenous participants, the subjectivities in these mechanisms of power sharing are also linked to the organizational historical and physical linkage as it is housed in the old territorial office of education or public libraries house colonial knowledge, to the colonial legacies of the territory, and the mistrust of institutions. These axiological
legacies create a persistent perception of this space and place being imbued with or the embodiment of injustices underscored the importance of providing “in community” services that are un/decolonized.

Participants’ lived experience of *indigenous self-determination* both cases is also found in the nested heterogeneity narratives of colonial experiences and the lived, practiced, and relational knowledges and relationships. These nested narratives of colonial legacies, continued settler colonialism, and internalized colonialism are linked to a lack of resources, services, and power that constrains community and individual agency and leads to the previously mention caution and mistrust. In both cases this is observed to be disrupted by the assertion of identity and culture tied directly to place.

For the Tŝilhqot’in it is about asserting their rights and responsibilities, their political agency, while un/decolonizing spaces and places within the complex relationship of cultural well-being of their Nation, community health, and citizens quality of life. For participants it is necessary therefore to address the lack of culturally responsive services and the geographic constraints of rural and remote service delivery, the space between of abjection and marginalization that is linked to each case’s socio-historic contexts. This space between also provides the opportunity for developing un/decolonized partnership with Write to Read BC and their partners (i.e., UBC Dental) and for shifting to a model of working with that honours Tsilhqot’in ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing interrelated elements in social citizenship processes and practices. As Lister (2004) argues political agency occurs when these collective and cultural elements are combined with participants subjectivities. Tsilhqot’in social citizenship, their self-determination, is also linked to right and title case and to their rights as and their responsibilities Tsilhqot’in dene (people) to protect the sacred (people, land, all living beings, language, laws, and cultural processes and practices). As Chief Joe Alphonse states for the Tsilhqot’in people, “education is the new battlefield”. Therefore, the implication is that literacy equity is not just about addressing the 150 years of underserved and underfunded reality of many Indigenous communities but also about un/decolonizing and creating culturally responsive spaces and places to learn. Also, spaces and places to continue to address the larger sociopolitical processes embedded and internalized in the continued settler colonial reality. Write to Read BC has the potential to be a model of how to un/decolonize by working with to build trust through participation, partnerships, and shared power.

In the second case, these nested narratives also demonstrate how spaces and places for participation, power sharing, and partnership are layered with participants’ lived experiences
of colonial legacies, continued settler colonialism, and internalized colonialism. For most participants, the 30 plus years of collectively taking part in the land settlement and self-government agreement process is perceived to create a sense of belonging for Settler participants, what Douglas (Settler) describes as being in it “all together, no separation”. This process is perceived to create an environment of shared relational accountability, shared power, and resources to created shared spaces like Dusk’a where Kwanlin Dün ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing are not just written back into the narrative but go beyond organizational rhetoric to praxis. Although the YCDC and the Dusk’a site are seen as spaces and places of un/decolonizing, subjectivities in participants narratives also show that most of the Indigenous participants feel the YCDC could do even more to un/decolonize services, spaces, and relationships. In conjunction with the impact of the “come from aways” in creating urban centres of service such as Whitehorse, the draw of professionals from elsewhere is argued to necessitate a reclaiming and reframing of spaces and places as a continuation of the advocacy and negotiations observable in the local axiology of relational accountability. By recentring local Indigenous ways, Dusk’a also has the potential to be a model for decolonizing services, from needs based to self-determining autonomy in family services that creates spaces and places of literacy equity that are locally developed, controlled, and delivered fostering agency in knowledge production and power sharing.

The second case also provides specific insight into women’s lived experience of social citizenship processes and practices as all but one participant is female and the CSO under investigation, both sites, were 95 percent plus staffed by female childcare professionals. Their perspectives highlight the subjectivities in lived experience of the connection to space and place for participants and generational differences and contestation of the positive impacts of the land settlement and self-government agreements. For the Elders it is observed and shared that the land settlement and self-government agreement lead to a loss of the sense of belonging due to forced relocation and how place-specific social citizenship processes and practices are no longer possible in the ‘new village’. These negative impacts on Elders’ sense of belonging, as well as other generations to the land, culture, and language, are linked by participants to continued settler colonialism, internalized colonialism, and the increase in addictions and violence, specifically Elder abuse, observed in the ‘new village’. These generational subjectivities also amplify the perception of the importance of space and place of service location. the YCDC is located in a building imbued with the colonial history of Indian Residential Schools thus making perceived un/decolonizing locally
controlled spaces and places like Dusk’a so important for all the Indigenous participants. Of equal importance to all participants is the perceived role of communication and ease of navigating organizational systems in engendering trust (i.e., scheduling and service eligibilities). These two aspects in conjunction with participants’ lived experiences of social citizenship processes and practices indicates how both can create opportunities or spaces of agency as well as continued abjection and there is thus a need for ongoing un/decolonizing.

Agency as resilience in both cases is centred around persistent inequalities as a result of participants’ lived experiences of continued settler colonialism and intergenerational traumas as well as the counter narratives of political agency. Citizenship and agency according to Lister (2003) are corelated through both generative and hierarchical power relations. Therefore, the legacies of epistemic injustice, heteropatriarchy, and racialization inherent within participants’ lived experiences of continued settler colonialism are argued to concurrently enable agency, abjection, and resilience.

In the first case, agency as resiliency is linked by Tšilhqot’in participants to continued political agency despite the “silencing” of social citizenship processes and practices, colonial legacies, and internalized colonization following the Tšilhqot’in War. There is an observable shift following Tšilhqot’in Nation v. British Columbia (2014) case when political agency and self-esteem are also linked by participants to the narratives of lived experience of being the first Indigenous Nation in the world to have their inherent rights and title judicially ratified by a settler colonial supreme court. This is also observable in Tšilhqot’in communities and participants narratives through the perceived change in confidence and sense of political agency expressed post title case win. It is argued, and observed through my continued work with the Nation, that agency as resiliency will continue to be needed in the negotiations with the Provincial and Federal governments in implementing this land title win in accordance with the agreement and accord that have now been signed by all parties. Agency as resilience in this case, and in other research (Bhattachryya et al. 2012; Dinwoodie, 2002), also emphasizes the connection between Tšilhqot’in sense of their identity with place and to their relationship with land. Nested within the lived experience of social citizenship are participants’ ways of being, their ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing and nested within those are the collective ideological how to’s. Therefore, agency as resiliency can be either power as an example of political or social agency or power sharing, or resilience or relational resilience. It is an example of personal and collective survival praxis via self and communal resources that are connected to a sense of belonging or attachment through social identity or the land, or both at the same time.
Relational responsibility and accountability to the land are interwoven with cultural axiologies of respect and ontologies, epistemologies, and methodologies of inherent place-based knowledge. In the second case, Indigenous participants’ lived experience of agency as resiliency is argued to also be the counter narrative of political agency and in this case developed as the sustaining response to the persistence of the entrenched citizenship-status inequalities linked to race, class, gender, ability, and age. Similarly, agency as resiliency in this space and place is also interconnected with the resilience of self in relation to the land or environment that is interconnected to sense of self. Legacies of mobilization, advocacy, and negotiations create shared and interconnected experiences that many participants, both Settler and Indigenous, felt not only leads to completion of the first urban land settlement and self-government agreement, but also creates the opportunity and fosters an environment for partnership, jurisdiction over local knowledge production, and opportunities for un/decolonizing processes and practices, for participation, and for power sharing. All participants agree that the having the YCDC embedded into the Dusk’a site delivering service with the community is re-centring Indigenous ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing and is argued to be un/decolonization in action. Dusk’a is argued therefore to be an example of grassroots indigeneity in action, of indigenous difference and indigenous self-determination through educational jurisdiction that creates a renewed agency as resilience for Indigenous participants enacting social citizenship processes and practices with a CSO.

Subjectivities in the lived experience of the interconnection between place and identity in this case are however clearly generationally, and participants counter narratives revealed conflicting perceptions of whether these land settlement and self-government agreements are tools of self-determination or just another tool of colonialism and acculturation as Palmater argues (2011). The biggest difference in this case is the generational and matrilineal counter narratives. They truly highlight the concurrent lived realities of the impact of land settlement agreements and how normalized perceptions of Indigenous people persist throughout the territory, even within interactions with an un/decolonizing CSO like the YCDC. These counter narratives also highlight how the land settlement and self-government agreements create distinct generational experiences and impacts, for example the experience of ongoing violence and Elder abuse in juxtaposition to the matrilineal resurgence of young mothers and intergenerational trauma survivors. Persistence of epistemic injustices, heteropatriarchal, and racialized colonial legacies work in concert within the socio-historic context of continued settler colonialism to create spaces where Elders and intergenerational trauma survivors are more susceptible to shared narratives.
of abuse and violence. These shared narratives also call attention to how disconnecting, demoralizing, and devastating these lived experiences are. They call attention to how the intergenerational transmission of colonial violence is connected to the violence against women, to the unhealthy social reality of abuse and addiction that some participants continue to experience due to the persistence of continued settler colonialism, and to internalized colonialism not acknowledged or address within the land settlement and self-government agreements. These counter narratives are also examples of lived, practiced, and relational agency in an abject situation, or as argued here agency as resiliency.

Thus, there also continues to be an inherent mistrust of colonial systems, i.e., the government, government funding or affiliated organizations, RCMP, and therefore the YCDC by affiliation. The YCDC will continue to share in this institutional mistrust as long as it is perceived as “governmental” and housed in a space that embodies historical colonial logics. Based on this comparative intersectional indigeneity analysis, I would also add the lived experience of agism in the shared narratives of generational agency. The comparative intersectional indigeneity analysis in this chapter also allows for the examination of processes and practices, here social citizenship, at the macro, meso, and micro levels for inclusiveness and solidarity and also when interactions fall short, and the lack of reflexivity and accountability have led to coopted knowledge, silencing, exclusion and misrepresentation in both spaces and places. It also demonstrates how building non-oppressive political and social partnerships fosters participation and power sharing while highlighting spaces for continued collaborative un/decolonizing praxis and agency as resiliency in these shared sites of knowledge production.

7.6 Summary of the Comparative Analysis Highlights

The intersectional indigeneity approach used in this comparative analysis highlights what Bilge (2013) maintains are the interlocking power structures that produce and sustain the persistent epistemic injustices of the problematized context of continued settler colonialism. Considered as a spatial phenomenon CSOs are the complex web of social relations where a spectrum of social agency can occur. Both CSOs under examination allow for an exploration of whose knowledge counts within the interactions of Indigenous and Settler participants shared social action and knowledge production. Knowledge production in both cases is linked to advocacy for literacy and social service equity and agency as resiliency in the context of continued settler colonialism. Counter hegemonic knowledge production as inferred from participants’ agency as resiliency demonstrates how continued settler colonial logics and material mechanism persist to both privilege and abjectify, and
often do so simultaneously. Agency and resiliency are observed to work in concert in both cases as counter hegemonic knowledge production is nested within both sites, enacted, embodied, and emplaced on the land, and centres on concepts of *indigenous difference* and *indigenous self-determination*. The second case also highlights nested divergent matrilineal and generational subjectivities in these Indigenous women and Elder’s lived experiences of violence and abuse within counter hegemonic narratives of indigeneity. These are inferred to be examples of lived, practiced, and relational agency as resiliency in an abject situation of continued settler colonialism, heteropatriarchal, racialized discrimination, and persistent gendered epistemic violence.

The shared social action and knowledge production at both sites, the CSOs praxis, are deemed by all participants as being in alignment with organizational rhetoric and are deemed to be ‘good’ examples of how to un/decolonize services when working with Indigenous individuals, groups, communities. However, all felt there is room for improvement – especially when it comes to cultural awareness and responsiveness. Further, the comparative indigeneity intersectional approach teases out convergent and divergent experiences of interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in knowledge production by exploring the professionalization and privilege of the predominately Settler professionals within each organization, the role of relational connections, and ontological, epistemological, and axiological praxis. If left unexamined continued settler colonialism can led to persistent epistemic violence of unequal power relations and marginalization that silences indigeneity praxis. Consider the space between in this research, both CSOs are also perceived by participants to be places where their knowledge counted and to be indigenized spaces of un/decolonizing services. Simultaneously, participants call on both CSOs to continue to work with Indigenous peoples and communities to un/decolonize and indigenize shared opportunities for participation, partnership, and power sharing. These are not one-off actions but ongoing social processes and practices, i.e., ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing.

Participants’ lived experience of the interconnected themes of social citizenship discussed in this dissertation: citizenship as reciprocity or rights and citizenship as belonging, relational or spiritual in both cases are nested within each sites socio-historic context and brings to the foreground a snapshot of the spectrum of shared ontologies underlying the epistemologies, axiologies, and methodologies of Indigenous and Settler lived experience of social citizenship at the sites under exploration. Participants’ lived experiences of these proposed shared paradigms, these ways, demonstrate how roles and agency within
interactions and relationships are expressed in accordance with these worldviews of what social citizenship is for Indigenous and Settler participants in hegemonic and counterhegemonic narratives of the national discourse in situ. Convergent experiences of the socio historic context of colonialism and the linguistic and sociocultural similarities highlights points of intersection in ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing of both Tŝilhqot’in and Kwanlin Dün construction of social citizenship processes and practices. The limitation in seeking or arguing for a shared paradigm is that it is also an essentializing process that seeks to create dichotomized categorization of concepts, in this case social citizenship processes and practices, and experiences that often decontextualize and deconstruct local meaning. Therefore, it is argued that these shared paradigms must also reflect the heterogeneity of participants, both Indigenous and Settler. The convergent and divergent points within their shared ontological foundations and epistemological, axiological, and methodological social citizenship processes and practices that are linguistically, contextually, and specifically place-based and demonstrate how participants frame and reframe, how they enact, embody, and emplace social citizenship as belonging, reciprocity, relational, and spiritual. Connections to and relationship with the land and divergent notions of self in relation nested in notions of ‘all my relations’ show that perceptions of social citizenship processes and practices are not always dichotomously opposed while simultaneously also shining light on the persistent colonial logics and mechanisms of continued settler colonialism and thus the differentiated ways citizenship as belonging, reciprocity, relational, and spiritual are constructed or lived, practiced, and relational.

In both cases, the argument is made that participants’ perceptions of the CSO as agent and their axiological praxis is deemed to foster participation, partnership and power sharing in social justice action, social service delivery, and advocacy in the space between where agency and abjection can be experience in concert in the everyday lived experience of social citizenship processes and practices. Participants’ perceptions of these sites of shared interaction reveal how an indigeneity praxis can shift colonial and settler-centric views, build bridges, and reframe relationships and social justice action and service to be more inclusive of the often abjectified. This principle of inclusiveness is perceived cautiously, especially by the Indigenous participants in both cases, as the consensus is only time will tell if the implementation of title and the land settlement and self-government agreements will truly be an example of grassroots indigeneity or a continuation of colonial logics and mechanism. Also in both cases, participants concurrent agency and abjection in the lived experience of social citizenship challenges the logics of power of continued settler colonialism, debunks the
notions of “post” colonialism, and necessitates a reimagining of the national discourse as participants experiences are argued to be politics in relations framed by the ontological, epistemological, axiological, and methodological concepts of power and place.

7.7 Reflexive Recap: some limitations

Finally, every study has limitations especially a doctoral study where data is coded, themed, and analyzed by one person and a supervisor or two. Although it allows for consistency it limits the breadth of perspectives. I would also like to acknowledge I am a Settler researcher of mixed heritage attempting to be accountable and responsible by being culturally responsive and watching as one Elder said my ‘midugh moments’. There are only 40 participants perspectives which limits the view as well, and the second case it is a gendered view of the Yukon and Kwanlin Dün as all participants are woman but one. As an adopted midugh in first case and a complete outsider in the second I have limited local knowledge and limited cultural linguistically understanding and this restricts the depth of insights and analysis of some of the specific place-based concepts of citizenship as well as fuller understanding of processes practices.
Chapter Eight: Social Citizenship in the Pacific Northwest

This research journey centres around the notion of whose knowledge counts and focuses on a single dimension of citizenship, the social. The exploration of both the similarities and dissimilarities in the lived experiences of social citizenship processes and practices highlight methods for and limitation to overcoming social inequalities that make attaining civic and political agency more difficult for some. The research thus explores these spaces and places of interaction in the Pacific Northwest and what they tell us about the perception and reality of the roles and interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in the lived experience of social citizenship. Exploring these linguistically, contextually, and specifically place-based social citizenship processes and practices demonstrate how participants enact, embody, and emplace social citizenship as belonging, reciprocity, relational, and spiritual. Divergent notions of connections to and relationships with the land as well as self in relation, self in relation to others, and collective in relations show that perceptions of social citizenship processes and practices are not always dichotomously opposed. Counter narratives spotlight the persistent colonial logics and mechanisms of continued settler colonialism and thus the differentiated ways social citizenship is framed or reframed, constructed, or lived, practiced, and relational. Participants’ lived experiences of social citizenship are situated in the context of continued settler colonialism to explore how this context shapes participants’ agency, what Lister (2004) calls a citizen’s generative power. This is inferred in participants’ complex nested often concurrent lived experiences of privilege and abjection in participation, partnership, and power sharing within their interactions with each of the CSOs and more broadly between Settler and Indigenous citizens. Through these processes and practices CSOs have ability to foster and/or hinder the development of generative power and agency of Indigenous people, groups, and communities.

Respecting the multiplicity of knowledge and “doing what whose way” are argued to be key in facilitating the continual processes of un/decolonizing action and ensuring culturally responsive social services. The CSOs under exploration facilitate these processes through the shift to work ‘with’ to co-create indigeneity in action. Indigeneity in action here is inferred as indigenizing, localizing, and turning the organizational language into action as an example of how to un/decolonize service delivery and make it more culturally responsive and relational in a specific space and place. I argue these sites of shared interaction reveal indigeneity in action can shift colonial and settler-centric views, build bridges, and reframe relationships, social justice action, and service to be more inclusive of the often abjectified.
They also reveal the wait and see attitude, a temporal caution in determining the fine line between grassroots indigeneity and a continuation of colonial logics and mechanisms in these processes and practices. Revealed are also limitations in the ability of CSOs to be un/decolonizing spaces for citizenship. In this research journey, the CSOs have the following limitations or hinder social citizenship in the following ways: the adaptability of lessons learned to other spaces and places, Settler professional speak, trustworthiness, physical spaces and places linked to colonial trauma, readiness, capacity and resources, and normalization of settler centric narratives and privilege. Both CSOs are thus argued to be imperfect practical examples of un/decolonizing in action.

Therefore, this final chapter restates the research problem and provides a brief snapshot of the methods used. A summary discussion of the results of this comparative case study will follow to highlight the analytical path I took exploring my research questions. The chapter will conclude with a discussion of my interpretations, insights, and implications as well as recommendations and additional research opportunities.

8.1 Whose Knowledge Counts ~ A Summary Discussion of the Results

The research explores spaces and places of interaction in the Pacific Northwest and what they tell us about the perception and reality of the roles and interlocking oppressions, power, and agency in the lived experience of social citizenship. This comparative case study design utilizes an intersectional indigeneity approach and mixed-qualitative methods to explore the macro level socio historical re-problematized context of continued settler colonialism, and the meso and micro level interplay of agency and power in the interactions between CSOs and Settler or Indigenous people, groups, and communities in the processes and practices of social citizenship. This multi level design ensures that a wide range of evidence is gathered including: 40 semi-structured interviews; sharing circles; direct participant, community, and organizational observation; and secondary data. These 40 participants’ perspectives and lived experiences of social citizenship and the wide range of evidence gathered allows for the fields of power to be explored and arguments around my research questions to be constructed.

Argued to be the space between in chapter three, the CSOs under exploration in this dissertation are also sites of lived experience of social citizenship, sites of citizenship, sites of research on citizenship and enable me to highlight whose knowledge counts via participants’ multiplicity of nested often blurred perceptions, a diversity of worldviews, and counter narratives. The socio-historic contexts of both cases and collective experiences of the fur trade, gold rushes, annexing of territory, colonial legacies, and logics are internalized and
normalized as well as resisted and countered through participants’ individual and collective agency as resiliency. Despite the CSOs being predominately privileged Settler professionals, *indigenous difference* is honoured to create spaces and places of belonging the enable an Indigenous axiological praxis as organizational values are perceived to be actualized. These narratives highlight how space and place can also trigger traumatic memories of colonial legacies, processes, and practices. The research journey of whose knowledge counts thus results in exploring knowledge production, agency, power, perceptions of citizenship, and values in action.

Shared sites of knowledge production intersect with *indigenous difference, indigenous self determination*, and agency as resiliency in complex, multi-layered, lived, embodied, blurred narratives that shift and in these two cases are reframed by title and land settlement and self-government agreements. Both sites are examples of ‘working with’ as a power sharing mechanism to rebuild trust by addressing continued settler colonial inequities in literacy resources and social services. These nested narratives show how Indigenous individuals, groups, and communities are still cautious and continue to mistrust. This is linked to colonial legacies, internalized colonialism, and continued settler colonialism which can constrain putting values into action, and thus individual, group, and community agency in participation, partnerships, power sharing. In both case these colonial logics and mechanism are continually being disrupted and contested through the relational connection of self, of identity to a specific place, and to the land itself. Write to Read BC and Dusk’a are both examples of efforts to un/decolonize and recentre Indigenous ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. They are also both reminders that un/decolonizing in action is a continual process across a range of dimensions including communication, organizational systems, and spaces and places, especially those linked to agency and abjection. The second case also provides gendered and generational perspectives that highlight a matriarchal feminism and counter narratives of continued settler colonialism’s persistent epistemic violence manifested in Elder abuse, gendered violence, and addictions.

Agency as resiliency is seen in participants’ agency in abject situations. Both cases also bring to light the nuances of caution, the limitations in the processes and practices of un/decolonizing in the current context of continued settler colonialism. Lived experiences of epistemic injustice, heteropatriarchy, and racialization are created by the context of continued settler colonialism that enables agency and abjection while simultaneously fosters resiliency. It is an example of social or political agency, power sharing, and resilience. It is also an example of a personal and/or collective survival in action. These processes and practices use
personal or communal resources connected to a sense of belonging that is social, or land based, or both. This relational responsibility and accountability to the land is a social form of respect for the ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing that are place-specific based knowledges. It is also interconnected with notions of self and resilience of self in relation to the land or environment. Argued as the counter narrative of normative political agency, agency as resiliency is the sustaining response to persistent entrenched citizenship-status inequalities linked to race, gender, ability, and age. The lived experiences of land title win as well as land settlement and self-government agreements show how they are perceived as tools of indigenous self-determination but also as potential tools of continued settler colonialism, of possible acculturation, and of further assimilation. These two cases also highlight the level of persistence of the normalization of continued settler colonial logics and mechanism. Participants’ counter narratives connect the continued epistemic injustices, heteropatriarchal, and racialized colonial legacies to the current persistent unhealthy social reality of violence against women, abuse, addictions, ableism, and ageism.

I argue citizenship as rights in both cases highlights what other scholars also state that there is nothing “post” about colonialism in Canada (i.e., Lowman & Barker, 2015; Coulthard, 2014; Holmes, Hunt & Piedalue, 2014; Hunt 2014). Problematizing the context as one of continued settler colonialism reframes these lived experiences of citizenship as rights as socio-political or social-civil abjection in the Pacific Northwest. As a result, what Fricker calls epistemic injustice (2010) is perceived and observed to persist as gendered violence, as intergenerational trauma, and as impacting matrilineal or matriarchical and relational collective rights. There is a common thread of how the macro level imposed colonial ideologies and meso level practices frame these shared narratives of who is what kind of citizen across the heterogeneity of Indigenous participants’ lived experience. This differential positioning in perceptions of continued settler colonial logics and attitudes in relation to citizenship as rights can lead to miss-framing social distress or change as social and cultural collapse. The lens of continued settler colonialism allows these lived experiences to be reframed as being simultaneously fostering both agency and abjection. As Coulthard (2014) argues the context of continued settler colonialism allows for a critical examination of negotiated structural and material change to discern true un/decolonizing processes and practices from persistent colonial epistemic violence. This research therefore discerns that both CSOs, at the sites of research, use the discursive tool ‘with’ as a tool of un/decolonizing and inclusion at the micro level of interaction.
The lived experience of citizenship as belonging further highlights how inclusion and exclusion, privilege and abjection, work in concert. Belonging in both cases is more nuanced and nested within other narratives of the relational and spiritual that are often mistaken for solely social processes and practices. This mis-framing does not account for the perceived sacredness of the relational connection to the land and the interconnectedness of all things for Indigenous participants across both cases. These notions or aspects of social citizenship are nested in the divergent dynamism of perception of self in relation, self in relation to others, and the collective in relation. These perceptions are place specific, a multiplicity of knowledge based on diverse cultural norms that lead to specific value-based protocols, processes, and practices. Tšilhqot’in participants’ lived experience of citizenship as belonging is also simultaneously woven together temporally and relationally with the history of the Tšilhqot’in War and settler colonial logics that are often also internalized. Belonging is about respect and reciprocity for collective and familial, it is communal, and land based. In the first case, citizenship as belonging highlights the divergent perspectives of the land and its relationship to citizenship and how it also persists as a colonial mechanism of power, i.e., as an object to possess and a resource to use. The diversity of participants in the second case demonstrates how varied experiences of citizenship as belonging, as one of being a part of, are. It also acknowledges that these experiences are influenced by the socio-historic context of continued settler colonialism, a lens that allows for counter-narratives of exclusion, abjection, and resiliency to also be voiced. Settler participants acknowledge that the education system continues to be infused with colonial perceptions that normalize national myths. This plays a part in continued settler colonial norms and persistence of spaces and places of abjection. Experiences of belonging in both cases are complex and nested within the processes, practices, and production of shared experience, knowledge, responsibility, and accountability of self in relation, self in relation to others, and the collective in relation. The counter narratives that the problematized context of continued settler colonialism and an intersectional indigeneity approach also show how these experiences can simultaneously exclude and include, as well as how acculturation through proximity persists as does the perceived prevalence of internalized colonialism.

Nested in narratives of citizenship as belonging is the aspect of citizenship as relational and the lived experience of this aspect of social citizenship brings to light counter narratives to the national discourse. Narratives of the denial of the inherent relational right to land, to indigenous difference and indigenous self-determination in the context of a continued settler colonial state. Also, these lived experiences highlight the divergent and convergent
views of and relationship with the land Indigenous scholars like Wolfe (1999), Coulthard (2014), and Palmater (2015) argue is at the root of persistent colonial logics and mechanisms of control of people and land. Dispossession of land has adverse consequences on culture, language, ways of life and understanding of ways of being and all participants speak of these impacts on ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. Some of the Settler participants in the first case talk of being motivated to action by these impacts, the abject social conditions, and lack of social resources observed. T’silhqot’in participants also speak of adverse impacts to the sense of belonging, to the relational connection to land and sense of self in relation, self in relation to others, and collective in relation. The land is seen as a place and space of their collective narratives, a living relation that sustains the T’silhqot’in people, a source of cultural strength and connection, and a site of knowledge production in accordance with seasonal rounds. Being T’silhqot’in is relationally and intrinsically tied to the land and rights and responsibilities are interwoven collectively through relational accountability to the interconnection of all living things. The title win is sparking a shift in self confidence and a cultural awakening. It is also seen a battle win for the right to a un/decolonizing T’silhqot’in processes and practices and the actualization of political agency and indigeneity. In the second case, Settler participants perceive the relational aspects as again being part of or participation in that in the Yukon is grounded in relation reciprocity of space and place. There is an overall recognition of role of land in relationships as well as the perceived effects of the process and the land settlement agreements themselves. However, there is also a caution and consideration of space, a caution of taking the YCDC and Dusk’a examples out of the socio historic context. Again, in this case Indigenous participants’ conceptualization of citizenship as relational is linked to the land and interconnected to self in relation, self in relation to others, and the collective in relation. Citizenship as relational is a relational reciprocity in action, shaped and reshaped over time by continued settler colonialism, and it is seen as indigeneity praxis. These counter narratives of the relational also demonstrates how settler colonialism persists and how for some the land settlement and self-government agreements are perceived as contested tools of concession and compromise on unceded territory. Participants’ lived experience also show how the land settlement and self-government agreements are spaces of agency and indigeneity in action. They are perceived by both Settler and Indigenous participants to create spaces of connection and reconnection, of learning, of understanding, and potentially of un/decolonizing and reconciliation.

Narratives of self and self in relation to the land also call attention to another aspect of citizenship as belonging, that notion of spirituality. In both cases citizenship as spirituality is
complex, nested, multi-dimensional, and intrinsically linked to the role of language in expressing the sacred and ceremonial. Spirituality is not observed nor articulated in Settler perceptions in either case. Settlers in both cases acknowledge how colonial mythology links narratives of the west and north to concepts of settler certainty. Across both cases, colonial logics, and mechanism like the Indian Residential School legacy lead to the mistrust of Settler spiritual institutions. Assimilation of spiritual practices learnt in Indian Residential School is a lived reality for some Tšilhqot’in participants and is observed across the Nation to confound other survivors and their children and grandchildren. Citizenship as spirituality is ceremony that is imbued with the principle of respect that is fundamental to Tšilhqot’in laws. It is expressed in the language and traditional knowledge and is enacted in traditional and cultural processes and practices often tied to specific places or sacred spaces. In the second case, the ‘come from aways’ both Settler and Indigenous recognize in their lived experience of the place, that the notion of ‘all my relations’ and longstanding welcoming of the Kwanlin Dün does not constitute connection to land or kin. Citizenship as spirituality is expressed in the diversity of these narratives as an interconnected land-based sense of belonging tied to language, cultural, and sense of self and self in relation. Continued settler colonialism results in citizenship processes and practices being forced underground or not transmitted via matriarchical kinship systems predominate among the Indigenous people of what is now the Yukon. This as I argue creates a space for abjection and fear, mistrust, and interruption of natural generational societal development. These abject lived experiences foster epistemic violence against Indigenous women and Elders and also foster agency as resiliency through practiced and relational indigeneity. Citizenship as spirituality in this space is enacted, embodied, and emplaced in the healing processes and practices of matriarchy, the land, the culturally grounded action, the language(s), and the sacred spaces and places. It is the ethical interrelatedness of all things tied to land and specific sacred spaces. This place specific grounded indigeneity is also seen as a right of citizenship. Therefore, it is argued that agency as resilience and citizenship as spiritual and citizenship as relational are inter-connected, place specific, and simultaneously juxtaposed with participants concurrent lived experiences of continued settler colonialism.

At both sites of exploration, the CSOs ability through social services to enact organizational values from both an internal and external perspective is also about space and place. Culturally responsive action is seen in the shift in mindset from a legislated paradigm of providing service ‘to’, ‘for’, and ‘on behalf of’ to action that is based on the conceptualization of ‘with’. This shift in conjunction with notions of indigenous difference
spotlights both counter narratives in lived experience of social citizenship in the Pacific Northwest and underlines in these explored interactions the chances for un/decolonizing in action, for participation, partnership, and power sharing. Both sites call to attention how this paradigm shift to ‘with’ can help build and maintain the trust, understanding, and empathy required for un/decolonizing and reconciliation.

Seen through the lens of continued settler colonialism the counter narratives that emerge however also offer critiques for the CSOs to consider in the ongoing process of ensuring actions and relationships are culturally responsive. Critiques include siloed or intermittent communication, practices that embodied Settler professional privilege, request for increased advocacy, and need for continual decolonization and indigeneity praxis. Decolonization, or un-colonizing, is not a one off, not simply a policy statement, and is argued here to be an ongoing praxis that requires respect, adaptability, and diversity of views and multiplicity of knowledges that centres the voices of those participating, partnering, and sharing the power with the CSO. Settlers in both cases did acknowledge the of role Settler ignorance and normalization through education of settler-centric national discourse creates. The counter narratives of the first case demonstrate the power of indigeneity in action in the lived experience of the sense of belonging, collaborative cooperation, and opportunities for shared power. This power is also observed in the Indigenous participants’ simultaneous nested lived experience of abjection, exclusion, paternalism, and continued settler colonialism legacies, logics, and mechanisms.

Indigeneity in action as explored through Write to Read BC is argued to enable an agent to participate in direct non-colonial action that can lead to equitable partnership where settler privilege is minimized in a predominately privileged Settler organization through power sharing via indigenized social and political relations and actions. In the second case, participants acknowledge the impacts of continued settler colonialism on social services and how key building trust, fostering knowledge exchange, and increasing empathy are in enabling organizational values to be turned into social action. Counter narratives at this site of exploration underline also the importance of relational responsiveness and responsibility, of working with and centring marginalized voices in un/decolonizing the organization’s axiological praxis of political advocacy, and of working with in social service delivery. In this case it is also about whose knowledge counts, who is part of and has the opportunity for participation in the CSO knowledge production, in putting values into action, and in opportunities for partnership and power sharing. The YCDC and the Dusk’a are perceived as micro, meso, and macro level assets that are experienced as inclusive, diverse, and fostering
empathy and reciprocity which are argued to be the necessary components of an indigeneity praxis. Indigeneity in action takes into consideration, centres, and legitimizes Indigenous knowledges and social action. Again, through the lens of continued settler colonialism counter narratives in this case call attention to simultaneous lived experience of strained agency in the capacity to participate. This is seen in relation to participants own generative power and agency. It is also seen I argue in relation to material resources and socio historical barriers because of persistent structural inequities. These narratives also speak of the continued mistrust of institutions including the spaces of previous colonial institutions like the YCDC, intergenerational trauma, unsettled sense of belonging, impacts of the forced relocation from traditional territory, and strained agency. Thus, I argue that to continually un/decolonize organizational values in action, organizational language and action need to also be indigenized, as indigeneity and agency enable and legitimize alternative knowledges and social action.

This comparative intersectional indigeneity exploration of social citizenship processes and practices at these sites of interaction recognizes the simultaneous nested lived experience of spaces and places of inclusion and solidarity with those of exclusion and abjection. A persistent lack of reflexivity and accountability leads to coopted knowledge, silencing, segregation, and misrepresentation in both spaces and places. Both CSOs and sites of exploration are argued to be imperfect practical examples of un/decolonizing in progress of how building non-oppressive political and social partnerships promotes participation and power sharing. These imperfect practical examples also demonstrate the limitations of both CSOs in un/decolonizing in the context of persistent epistemic colonial injustice, the trauma of these physical spaces and places, the readiness for un/decolonizing, the readiness and capacity to put words into action, and the adaptability of these processes and practices to other spaces and places.

CSOs are argued to be a spatial phenomenon, a space between of shared knowledge production and social action. This space between as argued allows for the exploration of whose knowledge counts and is a space of advocacy and agency as resiliency. These shared sites of knowledge production also enable the construction of an argument for continued collaborative un/decolonizing praxis and the role of agency as resiliency in cultural resurgence and reducing cultural silencing. The fields of power in the Pacific Northwest demonstrate the interlocking power structures that both produce and sustain epistemic injustices in the context of continued settler colonialism. Land based place specific knowledge production calls attention to the roles of indigenous difference, indigenous rights,
indigenous belonging, indigenous self-determination, and indigenous spirituality in the lived experience of social citizenship. The second case also highlights what I see as a matriarchical feminism expressed in the continuance of moiety kinship system (laws, ceremony, protocols, relational accountabilities and responsibilities) that is interwoven into the land settlement and self-government agreements and guides the complex value laden knowledge production and localized indigeneity in action. Shared social action and knowledge production shows that values in action needs to be inclusive and un/decolonizing, a form of indigeneity in action. By centring the abject voices of the counter narratives via the lens of continued settler colonialism calls attention to un/decolonizing being a process that always has room for improvement. The expressed matrilineal and generational layers in the narratives of the second case also spotlight the persistence of heteropatriarchal, racialized discrimination, and gendered violence of continued settler colonialism. If left unexamined these unequal power relations and the marginalization inherent within continued settler colonialism can silence indigeneity in action.

Participants’ perceptions are nested in the socio historical context and are hegemonic and counterhegemonic narratives of the national discourse in situ. Both sites of exploration are perceived by participants to be to be imperfectly indigenized spaces in progress of un/decolonizing services and places where their knowledge can count. These spaces and places between are argued to require working with Indigenous peoples, groups, and communities to continually un/decolonize and indigenize shared opportunities for participation, partnership, and power sharing. This is tied to how a CSO puts its values into action and the fostering of participation, partnership, and power sharing via indigeneity in action. These are not perfect stories of un/decolonizing but of the process of the ongoing journey of un/decolonizing the spaces and places in between. Indigeneity in action is also inclusiveness in action, belonging (being part of), and a localized cultural responsiveness that is place specific. This principle of inclusiveness is cautiously perceived in both cases as the lived experience of continued settler colonialism leaves Indigenous participants questioning if the land settlement agreements or implementing title are examples of indigeneity or persistent thinly veiled colonial logics and mechanisms. Thus, there is also an expressed caution around exporting these place-based practices to other spaces and places without ‘working with’ to localize how they are enacted, embodied, and emplaced. Navigating these fields of power, negotiating the ever-moving scale of power sharing is un/decolonizing in action.
8.2 Research Questions Revisited ~ Reflective Interpretations, Insights, and Implications

Through an intersectional indigeneity approach, participants’ hegemonic and counter hegemonic narratives of the lived experience of social citizenship are argued to be examples of the national discourse in situ within the Pacific Northwest. Utilizing a mixed-qualitative methods research design to thematic and comparative analysis these two cases reflexively enable me to centre the marginalized voices of the counter narratives which hold insights into continued settler colonialism persistent power to abjectify. These complex nested narratives of concurrent agency and abjection are also contestations of the fields of power of continued settler colonialism. I argue these nested narratives and counter narratives demonstrates there is nothing “post” about colonialism in contemporary social citizenship processes and practices in the Pacific Northwest, in the social realities of participants. Values in action I argue give us insights into how concepts of power, agency, and space and place are politics in relation that further indicate a necessity to re-imagine and re-examine how the national discourse is enacted, embodied, and emplaced in what is now called Canada.

The social and political implications of this research lie in how narratives, both privileged and marginalized, of the lived experience of social citizenship are situated in this re-problematized context of continued settler colonialism, a context that shapes the relational places and spaces of interaction in the spectrum of convergent and divergent social realities, worldviews, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing at each site of exploration. Comparatively the cases also foreground how traumatic memories of colonial legacies, logics, and mechanisms can also be triggered by space and place. Participants’ lived experience of the interconnected themes of social citizenship discussed in this dissertation are nested within each site’s socio-historic context and shows how inclusion and exclusion, privilege and abjection, work in concert. Analysis of these interconnected themes provide a snapshot of the convergent and divergent experiences of the socio historic context of colonialism and contemporary continued settler colonialism. It also highlights the linguistic and sociocultural similarities and points of intersection of social citizenship construction at both sites of exploration. The essentializing process of arguing for a shared paradigm of social citizenship processes and practices seeks to create dichotomized categorization of these concepts that often deconstructs local meaning and decontextualizes these lived experiences. Therefore, I argue, in the attempt to be reflective of the heterogeneity of participants both Indigenous and Settler, how participants frame and reframe social citizenship processes and practices is linguistically, contextually, and specifically based on place. This framing or
reframing is not always dichotomously opposed but does foreground the persistence of colonial logics and mechanisms of continued settler colonialism and thus the differentiated ways social citizenship is constructed as rights, responsibilities, and reciprocities, and as belonging, relational and spiritual. The later is often miss-framed as merely social without considering the perceived sacredness of some of these place-based processes and practices that include law, ceremony, prayer, and protocols.

In both cases the Indigenous participants share a lived experience of what some scholars argue (i.e., Lowman & Barker, 2015; Coulthard, 2014; Baptiste & Semaganis, 2002; Tully, 2008; Wilson, 2008; Wolfe, 1999) is the fundamental difference between Indigenous and Settler citizens: the relationship to the land. These hegemonic and counter hegemonic narratives of social citizenship also tell us how the land in turn shapes social reality, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing, and how values are put into action to shape one’s concepts of self in relation, self in relation to others, and collective in relation. Thus, throughout this dissertation it is argued that there are two often divergent views of citizenship as Settlers’ typically have a Eurocentric one which is often linear, hierarchical, individualistic, patriarchal, consumption-based, practical, and conceptualizes the land as an object or resources and this view tends to dominate the Indigenous holistic, interconnected, matrilineal, sustainable, spiritual view that conceptualizes the land as interconnected, a relation. The dominate Settler view does not consider the central and essential role of land, of citizenship as relational and citizenship as spiritual in an Indigenous worldview. Indigenous participants are relationally and spiritually interconnected with the land and all living things, and this conceptualization is what weaves together all the pieces of society to connect the natural world to the person, family, community, nation, and cosmos.

However, in both cases there are divergent aspects that are case specific. For example, in the first case, there is a predominance of the warrior society and culture in perceptions of what it means to be Tșilhqot’in as the traumatic memories of Tșilhqot’in War and the colonial legacies, processes, and practices continue to be central to notions self in relation, self in relation to others, and collective in relation, as central to how being Tșilhqot’in is framed. Since the title win and the exoneration of the Tșilhqot’in Warriors who were hung, there is a shift, an awakening of and reestablishment of Tșilhqot’in governance structures, the laws of relations, and the reestablishment of matriarchical power via the forming of a women’s council at the Nation level. In the second case there is what I argue a matriarchical feminism that has persisted since precontact, and these matrilineal kinship systems are also utilized in land settlement and self-government agreements in an attempt to reinstate
traditional governance structure through these contemporary agreements. Elders counter narratives of generative power the land settlement and self-government agreements are perceived to spotlight the generational experiences of persistent epistemic violence of heteropatriarchy and racialization of continued settler colonialism in the lived experiences of social citizenship that manifest in Elder abuse, disconnection to place and self, and addictions. These generational counter narratives also indicate, I argue, the need to add ageism to any intersectional research approach to further investigate the shift to Elder or Knowledge Keeper and how this has been impacted by the problematized context of continued settler colonialism. Un/decolonizing is a process of continual reflexivity and responsive action. By exploring this ongoing process, we can see further or ongoing challenges of CSOs organizational capacity to sustain this process over time and integrate other ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. Practically in Yukon case it is about advocating for a new shared space as there is a persistent mistrust of the government and colonial spaces and places of trauma. Indigenous participants’ narratives also highlight how these challenges are not just external but also internal as they face experiences of lateral violence, mental health and addition, gendered and Elder abuse, and readiness to pursue and sustain the ongoing process of un/decolonizing.

Indigenous participants’ counter narratives also build the argument that un/decolonizing require spaces and places to be indigenized, normalized, and legitimized; requires culture and language revitalization, with resources and mentoring; requires self and collective healing; and requires self and professional development to rebuild knowledge, capacities, and skills. CSOs communication and settler professional privilege in both cases are criticized and I argue for an indigeneity praxis of continuing un/decolonizing and indigenizing spaces and places so that the multiplicity of knowledges is honoured in knowledge production processes and practices. This includes being inclusive of coexisting multiple modes of communication that honour both relational and professional discourses. The YCDC case spotlights caution of developing universal ‘best practices’ as lessons from this case are localized place-based practices and may or may not be duplicatable in other spaces and places. Write to Read BC demonstrates how an indigeneity praxis of working with, sharing power, can not only localize a model to fit a specific place-based and community’s social service need but also ensures processes and practices are not decontextualizing nor deconstructing local meaning. Political agency Lister argues, and seen here, occurs when these collective and cultural elements are combined with participants’
experiences and is seen as the capacity for citizens to enact rights in accordance with existing culture and social structures.

The research also highlights possible next steps for each CSO including to un/decolonize CSO language as there is power in particles and plain speech. For Write to Read BC and Rotary a possible next step is to further explore whose knowledge counts using community led knowledge sharing circles in order to continue to centre Indigenous voices in literacy equity praxis as well as other social service and advocacy efforts. Further next steps focusing on basic education and literacy directly for Write to Read BC and Rotary are to work with communities to update or refresh existing centres and continue process of un/decolonizing social action, advocacy, and internal professional development. Rotary’s Four-Way Test\(^1\) could also be used as an ethical guide for Rotarians to further foster relationships with Indigenous individuals, groups in combination with the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada’s *Calls to Action* (2015) to guide shared knowledge production, action, participation, partnerships, and power sharing opportunities. Doing this in conjunction with centring Indigenous voices could enable Rotarians to go beyond ‘is it the truth’ to examine ‘whose truth’, whose knowledge counts in ‘the things we think, say and do’. Combining *Calls to Action* (2015) with Rotary’s Four-Way Test and areas of focus create opportunities for participation, partnership, and power sharing as well as the opportunities for Rotarians to un-colonize service, advocacy, and action with Indigenous individuals, groups, and communities. In the Yukon, there is the opportunity to continue to explore the importance of place and place-based processes and practices, pursue a purpose-built space not linked to colonial trauma, and increase diversity in the organization by seeking more gender balance with positive male role model and involvement in early childhood education. It is about bearing witness, being relationally accountable, and ensuring all our social action and advocacy is inclusive and open to other ways of being. It is about acknowledging and exposing the privilege and power of our roles and concurrent abjection of persistent interlocking oppressions. Centring the voice of the abject in the interactions of privileged and marginalized citizens and (non)citizens through an intersectional indigeneity approach enables this research journey of co-produced knowledge to be impactful as well as interconnected, grounded, transformed, sacred, and experienced as a living process.

\(^1\) The Four-Way Test is a nonpartisan and non-sectarian ethical guide for Rotarians to use for their personal and professional relationships. “Of the things we think, say or do: Is it the TRUTH? Is it FAIR to all concerned? Will it build GOODWILL and BETTER FRIENDSHIPS? Will it be BENEFICIAL to all concerned?”
Additional research is needed to further explore Tšilhqot’in governance and how reducing cultural silence is awakening matriarch power structures, processes, and practices. As well as a possible exploration of the similarities and difference in governance structures of societies and moieties note in this dissertation. Also, determining the full impact of the title win and land settlement and self-government agreements on the land, of any jurisdictional power shifts, on the relational aspects of citizenship, and on opportunities for participation, partnership and power sharing previously denied under colonial logics and material mechanisms will also require further investigation. This exploratory research could be used to further develop a framework for effective organizational change via un/decolonizing values in action. As well a revised approach for the discipline of intersectionality that is inclusive of the concept of ageism. Further research could also seek to complete a dissimilar design by adding two additional cases exploring the lived experience of Inuit and Metis social citizenship processes and practices with other CSOs who work ‘with’ communities, as well as with Indigenous owned and operated CSOs. As well, further exploration of matriarchical feminism and matriarchical knowledge production, the specific spaces of these ways of being, ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing. The continued examination of heteropatriarchy and interlocking oppressions, power, and agency also requires balance and future research on (pan)rematriation and interlocking joys. This shift can be seen in emerging research (see Jesse Wente, 2021) reframing the narrative with joyous stories.

These two cases are examples of a potential model of continual un/decolonizing CSO values in creating an indigeneity praxis that centres around the action of working with as a mechanism to build trust and empathy, continually maintain relationships and interconnections, centres other ways of knowing, doing, perceiving, and valuing, and creates shared narratives of un/decolonizing social services. Resilience, resurgence, and reducing cultural silence require as Indigenous Elder Wanda candidly calls for “changing stinking thinking”, it requires the ongoing process of un/decolonizing of CSOs values in action toward more culturally responsive indigeneity praxis of working with that honours multiplicity of knowledges in relations, places, spaces, services, and advocacy. The centring of Indigenous voices creates indigenized spaces of inclusion, a place to embed, to enact, embody, and emplace social citizenship processes and practices into the social actions of CSOs.
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Appendix A

Questions for interviews and sharing circles

- What would you like to see come out of my research?
- In your own words describe BC/Yukon to me. Your community.
- What social services are available to you locally?
- What are some of the key challenges facing your community and/or family?
- How important is it to have the W2R/YCDC in the community? Why?
- Describe your personnel experience, role. Connection or relationship with the W2R/YCDC
  - What is your perception of the service delivery or advocacy efforts of W2R/YCDC? Good and what can be improved or added? Do you feel your voice is heard? Do you feel you are involved in the process?
  - How long have you been connected to W2R/YCDC? Why?
- Why did you become a part of or get involved with the organization?
- What do you like best about W2R/YCDC? What could be improved or added?
- How does W2R/YCDC enact the mission, vision, and values of the organization in processes and practices?
- How do you measure W2R/YCDC impact on families/communities?
- How does W2R/YCDC meet the needs of the most marginalized?
- What does citizenship mean to you?
- Anything further you would like to add?
Appendix B

British Columbia & Tšilhqot’in Nation: Rotary’s Write to Read BC Project Case ~
Participants table and contextual information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Role w/ CSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alice</td>
<td>Tl’étinqóx</td>
<td>Settler (immigrant)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>UBC dental student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amarjot</td>
<td>Tl’étinqóx</td>
<td>Settler (immigrant)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>UBC dental student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annette</td>
<td>Tl’étinqóx</td>
<td>Tšilhqot’in</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Community W2R Champion Elder/Knowledge Keeper &amp; Muatriarcg Community Cultural Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alvin</td>
<td>Tl’étinqóx</td>
<td>Tšilhqot’in</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Community participant Knowledge Keeper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>Tl’ésqóx &amp; Tl’étinqóx</td>
<td>Settler (immigrant)</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Rotarian W2R Lead</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce</td>
<td>Tl’ésqóx</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Literacy Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>Tl’ésqóx</td>
<td>Tšilhqot’in</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Community W2R Campion Elected Councillor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dean</td>
<td>Rotary International</td>
<td>Settler (immigrant)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Rotarian Past Rotary International Vice President</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis</td>
<td>Tl’ésqóx</td>
<td>Tšilhqot’in</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Elected Chief of Tl’ésqóx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heather</td>
<td>Tl’étinqóx</td>
<td>Settler (immigrant)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Volunteer Dentist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iris</td>
<td>Tl’étinqóx</td>
<td>Settler (immigrant)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>UBC dental student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James</td>
<td>Government House</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Former Government House Lead Administrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jessica</td>
<td>Tl’étinqóx</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>UBC Dental Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judith</td>
<td>Government House</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29th Lt.Gov.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>Tl’ésqóx &amp; Tl’étinqóx</td>
<td>Settler (immigrant)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Literacy Advisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Larry</td>
<td>Tl’ésqóx</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Rotarian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A brief description of the participants, the coproducers of this knowledge, is provided below of each individual who was interviewed or participated in a sharing circle. These socio-demographic descriptors provided relate to the purposive participant selection criteria laid out in chapter four. They are organized alphabetically by assigned name; there were 24 individuals who participated.

Alice is a female, Settler, immigrant, dental student in her early twenties, and this who participated in the Write to Read Project’s Dental Mission with Tl’entinqox (2016).

Amarjot is a male, Settler, immigrant, dental student in his early twenties and who participated in the Write to Read Project’s Dental Mission with Tl’entinqox (2015 & 2016).

Annette is a female Tsilhqot’in Elder and language teacher from Tl’étinqox; her community appointed her to organize and do the cultural and traditional activities and sharing for the Write to Read Project’s Dental Mission (2015 & 2016). She lives on the reserve land, is a fluent speaker of Tsilhqot’in language and practices a traditional and cultural lifestyle with
her husband Alvin. She is a practicing Catholic. She is also an Indian Residential School Survivor.

Alvin is a male Tsilhqot’in Elder from Tl’etinqox and his is a professional forestry worker. He lives on the reserve land, is a fluent speaker of Tsilhqot’in language and practices a traditional and cultural lifestyle with his wife Annette. He participated and assisted his wife with the Write to Read Project’s Dental Mission (2015 & 2016). He is also an Indian Residential School Survivor.

Bob is a male, Settler, immigrant in his fifties. He is a retired police officer, an Aide de Camp for Government House of British Columbia, a Rotarian, and the co-founder of the Write to Read project. Since the conception of Write to Read in 2009, Bob has been involved in ever library learning centre development and delivery as well as ever dental mission,

Bruce (†) was a male, Settler in his sixties. He was a retired public servant (Indian Agent and Tribal Council Executive Director), an educator, a literacy advocate, and was president of the board of the non-profit Cariboo Chilcotin Partners for Literacy Society. He was an advisor for the first library learning centre for the Write to Read project with Tl’esqox.

Clay is a male, Tsilhqot’in from Tl’ésqox. He is an elected councillor and employed by his community as the social development officer. He lives off reserve land while he continues to learn his language and practice his traditions and culture. He was a part of the leadership and community team for the first library learning centre for the Write to Read project.

Dean is a female, Settler, immigrant in her seventies. She is a retired nurse and the 2017/2018 Vice President of Rotary International. Although not directly involved with Write to Read, she has been a supporter of the project and promotes it at higher organizational levels.

Francis is a male, Tsilhqot’in from Tl’esqox, the elected chief (has been on and off for almost 35 years) and works with two tribal councils in Williams Lake. He lives on reserve land, is a fluent speaker of Tsilhqot’in language and is regarded as a knowledge keeper of traditional and cultural practices and processes. He was a part of the leadership and community team for the first library learning centre for the Write to Read Project. He is also an Indian Residential School Survivor.

Heather is a female, Settler, immigrant in her thirties and a Dentist. She was as a student on the initial Write to Read and UBC joint Dental Mission with an Indigenous community in
British Columbia. Since graduating, she has been a volunteer dentist and has participated in all 4 years of the Write to Read Dental Mission with Tl’etinqóx.

Iris is female, Settler, immigrant. She is a fourth-year female hygiene student in her early twenties who participated in the Write to Read Dental Mission with Tl’etinqóx (2015 & 2016).

James is male, Settler in his fifties. He is a public servant and acting deputy minister, former secretary to the Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia and a retired colonel with the Canadian Forces. He was the lead Government House administrator and thus oversaw the Write to Read project and helped to make it a permanent project of Government House done in partnership with Rotary International.

Jessica is a female, Settler in her forties. She is a Dental Hygienist, a UBC Faculty who participate with the Write to Read Project’s Dental Mission with Tl’entinqox (2016).

Judith is a female, Settler in her seventies. She is a rancher who specializes in holistic management, a past president of the British Columbia Cattleman Association, and the 29th Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia. She continued the Write to Read project opening 12 library learning centres and approved making it a permanent project of Government House in partnership with Rotary International.

June (†) was a female, Settler in her nineties. She was a retired teacher and principal, past president of the provincial retired teachers’ association, and vice-president of Cariboo Chilcotin Partners for Literacy Society. She was an advisor for the first library learning centre for the Write to Read Project.

Larry is a male, Settler in his fifties. He is a former Rotarian, and a projects manager who has worked with varies Indigenous communities across British Columbia for over 30 years. He was part of the team and was instrumental in helping to develop the project plan for the first library learning centre of the Write to Read Project.

Nick is a male in his early twenties who identifies as gay and as a ‘two-spirited’ male, Settler, immigrant. He is a dental student who participated in the Write to Read project’s Dental Mission with Tl’entinqox (2015 & 2016).
Roger is a male, Tšilhqot’in in his fifties. He is the former chief of Xèni Gwét’in, a mountain racer, former bull rider, former cattle rancher, and holds an honorary law degree. He is the original plaintiff in the Tšilhqot’in Nation v. British Columbia (2014) case that led to the Supreme Court victory and legal recognition of Aboriginal rights and title. He is a fluent language speaker and was raised traditionally by his single mother. He is also an Indian Residential School survivor. His community is the planning process for a new library learning centre with the Write to Read project.

Ron is a male who self identifies as a gay male, Settler in his fifties. He is a Rotarian, a professional funeral director and embalmer, and a lay minister for the United Church. He has worked with Indigenous communities for more than 25 years. He was also a member of the team for the first library learning centre for the Write to Read project.

Rosaline is a female, Tšilhqot’in Elder in her fifties from Tl’ëtinqóx. She is a former band councillor, former youth worker, and former community’s health department worker. She has been a part of the community team for all four years of the Write to Read Dental Mission with Tl’ëtinqóx. She is a fluent language speaker. She is also an Indian Residential School survivor.

Scott is a male, Settler in his fifties and a professional architect who volunteers his time and skills to the Write to Read project. He has worked with Indigenous communities and architect students for more than 25 years in both British Columbia and across Canada.

Shirley is a female, Tšilhqot’in in her forties from Tl’ésqóx. She is a former chief, and the former educational coordinator for her community. Shirley is the current Family Support Worker for Tl’ésqóx. She was the community project lead and overall project co-lead for the first library learning centre for the Write to Read project. She is a fluent speaker. She is also an Indian Residential School Survivor.

Steven (Xwē ƚɨ qwēl tēl) is a male, Sto:lo Elder in his seventies, is the current Chancellor of University of British Columbia, a former provincial court judge, past chief (youngest of his community), first Sto:lo lawyer, past chief commissioner of the British Columbia Treaty Commission, and the 28th Lieutenant Governor of British Columbia (the first Indigenous person to hold this position). He was the architect and co-founder of the Write to Read project and opened the first two library learning centres.
Tiara is a female, Tsilhqot’in youth from Tl’esqox. She was the young lady who was the spark for the first library learning centre for the Write to Read project. She was also the youth lead for the project.
Appendix C

Yukon & Kwanlin Dün First Nations: Yukon Child Development Centre & the Dusk’a Headstart Learning Centre ~ Participants table and contextual information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Citizenship</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Role w/ CSO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alayne</td>
<td>Whitehorse</td>
<td>Settler (‘come from aways’-Manitoba)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Ex. Dir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber</td>
<td>Whitehorse</td>
<td>Immigrant (Indigenous/‘come from aways’) (husband is Ta’an Kwach’an Council)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barb</td>
<td>Dusk’a</td>
<td>Indigenous</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chantelle</td>
<td>Dusk’a</td>
<td>Indigenous (‘come from aways’ Shuswap)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>Whitehorse</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Grandparent *Commission of the Yukon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erin</td>
<td>Dusk’a</td>
<td>Indigenous (Tahltan – Champagne and Aishihik First Nations)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Manager of Dusk’a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jolene</td>
<td>Dusk’a</td>
<td>Indigenous (Teslin Band citizen &amp; Kwanlin Dun member)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Grandmother (Elder)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kate</td>
<td>Whitehorse</td>
<td>Settler (‘come from aways’ – Nova Scotia)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kona</td>
<td>Whitehorse</td>
<td>Indigenous (‘come from aways’) (Kinistin Saulteaux First Nation)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyndsay</td>
<td>Dusk’a</td>
<td>Indigenous (Carcross First Nations)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mother ECE worker (former)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marguerite</td>
<td>Dusk’a</td>
<td>Settler</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Staff (Therapist)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie</td>
<td>Whitehorse</td>
<td>Settler (‘come from aways’: NWT)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>Whitehorse</td>
<td>Settler (‘come from aways’: BC)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Staff (SLP)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>Whitehorse</td>
<td>Settler (‘come from aways’: NWT)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Board Member</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stacey</td>
<td>Whitehorse</td>
<td>Indigenous (Tr’ondek Hwech’in)</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Mother</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A brief description of the participants, the coproducers of this knowledge, is provided below of each individual who was interviewed or participated in a sharing circle. These socio-demographic descriptors provided relate to the purposive participant selection criteria laid out in chapter four. They are organized alphabetically by assigned name; there were 16 individuals who participated.

Alayne is a female Settler who relocated to the Yukon in 1993 from Manitoba to take a position as a Speech Language Pathologist (SLP) and is the current Executive Director of the Yukon Child Development Centre. She was a SLP for 17 years working in both the outreach program that allowed her to visit and provide services in remote and rural communities, including Indigenous one, throughout the Yukon. In 2009, she became acting co-Executive Director, and has been the Executive Director since 2010.

Amber is an Indigenous female artist and traditional dance teacher originally from California who is married into the Jones/Dawson family and thus adopted into the Ta’an Kwäch’än Council (a First Nation band government in Whitehorse and Lake Laberge area that split from the Kwanlin Dun First Nation to negotiate a separate land claims agreement ). She is a parent of a child with special needs who accessed social services and advocacy from the Yukon Child Development Centre in Whitehorse.

Barb is an Indigenous female from the Carcross/Tagish First Nations. She is a new mother and her and her child are currently accessing services from both the Yukon Child Development Centre’s Outreach program in her community and via the Dusk’a centre.

Chantelle is an Indigenous female from Southern Secwepemc territory (British Columbia) who moved to the Yukon in 2007. She lived in Kwanlin Dun with her two children, (who are of mixed Secwepemc and Kwanlin Dun heritage), and one of her children accessed services and advocacy directly from the Dusk’a centre.

Douglas is a Settler male from the Yukon. His grandchildren have accessed services from the Yukon Child Development Centre and his wife is a member of the Board. He was also the Commissioner of the Yukon at the time of data collection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wanda</th>
<th>Dusk’a</th>
<th>Indigenous (‘come from aways’/Shuswap BUT Kwanlin Dun member)</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Grandmother &amp; Great Grandmother (Elder)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Erin is an Indigenous female from the Wolf Clan and identifies and Tahlltan and Tlingit and is a member of the Champagne and Aishihik First Nations. She is the Manager of the Dusk’a Head Start Family Learning Centre at Kwanlin Dun First Nations and is currently undertaking her Masters of Educational Leadership. She is 2016-2017 recipient of the Prime Minister’s Certificate of Excellence for demonstrating leadership in cultural excellence and encourages cultural opportunities through rich reciprocal relationships with Elders and the community.

Jolene is an Indigenous female Elder who is originally from the Teslin Band but is now a member of Kwanlin Dun. As a grandmother caring for her grandchildren, she has accessed services and advocacy via the Dusk’a centre for one of her grandchildren.

Kate is a Settler female originally from Nova Scotia who relocated to the Yukon specifically to access services and advocacy for one of her children who has special needs. She and her family have only been in the Yukon for less than a year, and are currently accessing services and advocacy from Child Development Centre Yukon in Whitehorse.

Kona is an Indigenous female from Kinistin Saulteaux First Nation (Saskatchewan) and relocated to the Yukon due to professional opportunities in 2005. Both of her children accessed services and advocacy from the Yukon Child Development Centre’s Whitehorse Centre, one was on the case load to help with speech development and one went to the daycare program.

Lyndsay is an Indigenous female from Carcross/Tagish First Nation who relocated to Whitehorse in 2013 in order to access better services directly from the Yukon Child Development Centre via both the Whitehorse and Dusk’a centres for her child who has special needs. She was also employed at Dusk’a as an Early Childhood Educator.

Marguerite is a Settler female from the Yukon. She is developmental therapist and previously community education program coordinator for the Yukon Child Development Centre and works out of their office at the Dusk’a centre in Kwanlin Dun. She is also a member of the Outreach program team.

Marie is a Settler female originally from the Northwest Territories and came to the Yukon when she was a young child with her family. Of her three children, two are currently accessing services and advocacy from the Yukon Child Development Centre in Whitehorse.
Rachel is a Settler female originally from British Columbia and relocated to the Yukon due to professional opportunities. She has been a Speech and Language Pathologist with Yukon Child Development Centre since 2004, has worked out of the Dusk’a centre’s office in Kwalin Dun, participated in the Outreach program across the Territory, and is now a program coordinator at the Whitehorse centre.

Sarah is a Settler female originally from the Northwest Territories who relocated to the Yukon; professionally she is a nurse. She is currently a Board Member. Both of her children have accessed services from the Yukon Child Development Centre in Whitehorse, and one of her children went to the daycare program at the Dusk’a centre.

Stacey is an Indigenous female from Tr’ondëk Hwëch’in First Nations who grew up in Dawson City and relocated to Whitehorse specifically to raise her family and for professional opportunities. She is currently the Cultural Education Coordinator for the First Nations Health Programs centre at the Yukon Hospital Corporation. Two of her four children access services and advocacy from the Yukon Child Development Centre in Whitehorse.

Wanda is an Indigenous female Elder from the Upper St’at’imc, who relocated to the ‘old village’ in Whitehorse in the 1980s. She is now a member of the Kwanlin Dun First Nations. She is a retired Licenced Practical Nurse. One of her children accessed services and advocacy from Yukon Child Development Centre in Whitehorse, and a grandchild, who she raised, accessed services and advocacy via Dusk’a Centre.